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"Every part of nature teaches that the passing away of one life is the making room for another. The oak dies down to the ground, leaving within its rind a rich virgin mould, which will impart a vigorous life to an infant forest. The pine leaves a sandy and sterile soil, the harder woods a strong and fruitful mould.

So this constant abrasion and decay makes the soil of our future growth. As I live now so shall I reap. If I grow pines and birches, my virgin mould will not sustain the oak; but pines and birches, or, perchance, weeds and brambles, will constitute my second growth."

Henry David Thoreau
Journal, October 24, 1837
To my Father

Benjamin John Gaynor

(1903 - 1972)

A man who planted oaks.
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ABSTRACT

Recent literature in the field of adult development and aging was examined in an attempt to explore the various factors involved in the process of social disengagement. The following factors emerged as crucial to this process:

1. the departure of children from the family;
2. retirement;
3. widowhood;
4. changing self concepts;
5. relocation.

An examination of the various disciplinary approaches to this problem revealed the need for an ecological approach in which man and his environment are both viewed as capable of initiating change.

The need for intervention to retard or reverse the disengagement process was postulated. Laboratory training was hypothesized as one possible framework for such intervention.

A laboratory training experience was designed for a randomly selected sample of senior citizens living at the Southern Colonial Apartment Complex for the Elderly in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. In this process, three measures were employed as indices of change. They were as follows:

1. The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientations--Behavior (FIRO-B)
2. The State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI)
3. The Internal-External Control Scale (I-E Scale).

In regard to the senior citizens who participated in this experiment, both statistical and experiential data lent strong support to the following hypotheses:

1. An individual senior citizen's behavior was amenable to change.

2. Change could occur in a short-term interpersonal, experiential setting (specifically, a laboratory training weekend workshop), and

3. Laboratory training did offer a feasible and practical approach toward retarding or reversing the disengagement process.

Specific training errors were noted and recommendations were made for further research.
"We grant goal and purpose to the ascent of life, why not to the descent?"

So expressed Carl Jung (Brine, 1970, p. 53) who viewed aging as a process of continuous inward development or individuation with important psychic changes occurring right up to the time of death. Jung questioned Western society's transference of the concept of mechanical obsolescence, a bi-product of the industrial era, to embrace that of human obsolescence and suggested the need for a reversal of this process.

No reversal has occurred and, consequently, Western society is now facing one of the most acute dilemmas of the twentieth century--the disengagement of a large segment of its population. The psychological implications of such a phenomenon are staggering. For example, the process of disengagement poses a definite threat to the concept of generativity.

Yet, psychologists have lagged behind in developing sound methods of social intervention. In fact, with few exceptions, most psychologists have simply ignored the process of aging altogether. Erik Erikson was astonished by Western society's avoidance of examining the whole of life and expressed the thought that "any span of the cycle lived without vigorous meaning, at the beginning, in the middle, or at the end, endangers the sense of life and the meaning of death in all whose life stages are intertwined (Brine, 1970, p. 53)."
Psychologists have now been called upon to explain the phenomenon of social disengagement, to recommend healthy and fulfilling ways of living in later years, and to assist in developing methods of retarding or reversing the disengagement process.

Never has a field been so totally unprepared! The results have been chaotic. Each discipline or school of thought has pursued its own unique approach to the problem and, consequently, volumes of data have been collected in support of one theory or another. In this process, each discipline has attempted to offer a unique behavioral prescription for healthy aging. However, to date, no discipline has been able to develop a sound method of social intervention designed to retard or reverse the disengagement process. It is the intention of this research to explore this area.

Overview

It is the intent of this introduction

(1) to examine the process of disengagement;

(2) to explore four disciplinary approaches to this problem—developmental, clinical, social, and learning—thereby attempting to impose some order onto current theoretical trends and research findings;

(3) to suggest a fifth alternative—an ecological approach;

(4) to give credence to the value of laboratory training in such an approach.

(5) to point out the need for sound measurement, and

(6) to offer an extensive review of the two pilot projects which served as a basis for this investigation.
The Process of Disengagement

Spurred by the impetus of the 1961 and 1971 White House Conferences on Aging and by such cogent exposes as "Growing Old in America: The Unwanted Generation" (Brine, 1970), social and behavioral scientists have begun to examine the position of the aging individual in Western society (Busse and Pfeiffer, 1969; Eisdorfer and Lawton, 1973). In this process, a precise description of the concept of social disengagement has emerged (Cumming and Henry, 1961). Specifically, disengagement is defined as a process of mutual withdrawal on the part of the aging individual and his society; whereas, engagement is seen as an interpenetration of the individual with his society. Thus an engagement-disengagement continuum emerges.

A review of recent research findings suggests that the following factors affect the disengagement process: (1) the departure of children from the family, (2) retirement, (3) widowhood, (4) changing self concepts, and (5) relocation.

The Departure of Children from the Family

Cumming (1964) conceptualized the disengagement process as beginning with the departure of children from the family. This trend does not appear to be reversible. Aring (1972) pointed to the decline of the multi-generation family over the past thirty years and suggested that the present constellation consists of a two-generation family in which the younger members are always moving out. Aring implied that adulthood has become directly related to independence and that this concept has created a problem for the elderly person. This
is in contrast with Eastern society, specifically Japanese society, in which independence is at its peak after the age of sixty.

According to Aring, "Eastern philosophy encourages the continuing development of the inner self as a natural inclination in the elderly (p. 140);" whereas, in Western society aging brings gradual isolation, loneliness, and unproductive idleness.

Retirement

Retirement is defined as the prescribed transition from the position of an economically active person to the position of an economically nonactive person in accordance with the norms through which society defines and determines the nature of this change (Orbach, 1962). At this time, retirement is another factor which does not appear to be reversible. This in itself is quite unfortunate because current research reveals the personal destructiveness of the concept of forced retirement. For example, Busse (1961) found that, for the individual, the retirement process brings (1) isolation resulting from a separation from an opportunity to work productively and/or from an opportunity to be associated with large groups of people and (2) depression resulting from a loss of self-esteem.

Goodstein (1962), supporting this contention, suggests further that retirement has become especially depresssing to the aging individual in Western society where work represents (1) the source of economic security, (2) status and prestige, (3) a way of achieving and maintaining personal independence, (4) a source of personal identification, (5) a means of providing social contacts, and (6) a way of taking up time.
These factors account, in large part, for the amount of resistance to retirement.

Lowenthal and Chiriboga (1973) have further examined the concept of resistance to retirement and offer the following conclusions:

We have seen that the happiest preretirees are those who rank low on both resources and deficits. From a practical perspective, it would appear that those whom Korchin (1965) might call dull may be those most likely to grow old gracefully and happily in our culture. The more complex preretirees, with possibly a greater potential for contributing to society, perhaps because they have such a potential, are not as happy as they face a life stage in which the absence of social demands may in itself become a genuine stress. By cutting off those persons about to retire from challenge and opportunity, and, yes, even from social stress, we may enable the dull to continue to be happy; but the complicated and possibly the most gifted are likely to become objectively maladapted and subjectively miserable unless they transcend social prejudices and strictures (p. 304).

In the process of exploring the factor of retirement, it became apparent that this present generation of senior citizens has little respect and preparation for leisure-time activities. This opened up one possible avenue for social intervention.

In examining senior citizens' attitudes toward leisure, the Houston Mental Health and Leisure Study, as reported by Gaitz and Gordon (1972), concluded that (1) the greater the participation in leisure activities, the greater the person's sense of psychic well-being; (2) participation in the forms of leisure that are active rather than passive, external to the home rather than homebound, and social rather than individual will be more closely associated with psychic well-being; and (3) the form, strength and even direction of the relationship between leisure activity and psychic well-being will be strongly conditioned by the person's particular combination of sex
role, life-cycle stage, socio-economic status, physical health and ethnic group membership.

The most widely accepted definition of leisure is that of Joffre Dumazedier (1967) who conceptualized leisure as activity--apart from the obligations of work, family, and society--to which the individual turns at will, for either relaxation, diversion, or broadening his knowledge and his spontaneous social participation, thus the free exercise of his creative capacity. Yet, Nemeth (1971) suggests that the engaged senior citizen tends to reject this definition of leisure time, perceives leisure activity as wasteful and useless, and feels most worthwhile when he is engaged in some activity which has both personal and interpersonal merit. This view is further substantiated by Havighurst (1973) who suggested that "Americans as a rule do not take easily to leisure when it becomes available to them in the form of retirement (p. 611)."

Supposedly, from the time an individual takes his place in the working world until the time he enters retirement, he looks forward to the day when he can replace work with leisure activity. However, when retirement actually occurs, he is blatantly unprepared for the substitution. Unfortunately, leisure activities do not possess the same by-products as work activities. This dilemma prompted Havighurst (1962) to suggest the need to turn away from the one-dimensional man, from the work-oriented man, to a three-dimensional man, a man oriented equally to work, study, and play. For the twentieth century man who has found a way to combine work, study, and play, retirement is simply a reduction of the work dimension in his life, and a corresponding and compensatory
increase in the play and study dimensions. Thus, Havighurst is suggesting the need for a new life pattern—one in which leisure has a well-used function. This transition is presently being seen in American youth who can more easily conceptualize the value of such a tri-partite arrangement than can their parents and grandparents who find it difficult to separate the nature of their work role from that of their social role.

Orbach (1962) suggests that the most difficult experience involved in the process of retirement is that of moving from a role-defined situation to a role-ambiguous situation—which is an awesome task for a man who has been conditioned over a long period of time to his former role. He does not see his new role, which is beset with a lack of socially defined appropriate behavior, in a very positive light. In fact, Orbach states that men view retirement as a negation of the traditional values surrounding the place of work in Western society and they therefore are loath to surrender their identifying position in that society.

The Princeton Study (1955) found that compulsive fixed-age retirement resulted in (1) fear of old age and death; (2) fear of being idle; (3) desire to continue working; (4) feelings of uselessness; and (5) fear of losing old friends. It further suggested the need for retirement counseling. Others (Gatter, 1962; Pressy, 1955; Slavick, Smith, Schultz, McConnell, and Scope, 1962) have pointed to the need for educational programs to assist the person in making a transition from work activity to leisure activity. More recently, Farnsworth (1972) indicated that behavioral scientists are finding it valuable to approach
this problem via group methodology.

Widowhood

Widowhood is another difficult experience with which many elderly people must cope. Berardo (1967, 1968) suggests that widowhood among the aged is a critical situation which involves both social and personal disorganization. Bock and Webber (1972) state that old statuses and roles are lost and point out that new relationships must be substituted in order to effect a satisfactory adjustment to a changed situation. They further suggest that "the maintenance of a set of personally satisfying self-conceptions depends on the availability of alternative patterns of roles and relationships. The elderly widowed person, however, is likely to face a vaguely defined situation which lacks clear-cut cultural guidelines. Nebulous and contradictory expectations become the social context of the new status confronting the aged survivor (p. 24)."

So disruptive is the experience of widowhood to an aging individual, that it has become a major factor in the etiology of suicide (Gibbs, 1968; Rushing, 1968; Maris, 1969). Further, Bock and Webber's study found that widowhood placed the elderly male in a more difficult position than it did the elderly female. They postulated the need for the widowed individual to reorganize his roles and relationships in order to successfully cope with the presenting situation and pointed to the importance of developing a network of community relationships.

Changing Self Concepts

There seems to be a strong increase in unmet needs as an
individual lives out his later years. This is usually precipitated by a loss of status and a decrease in self esteem. Palmore (1969) summarizes four variables which contribute to this change. They are as follows:

1. Decreased importance of land and capital as a source of income and status.
2. Decreased importance of the extended family.
3. High rates of geographic mobility.
4. Rapidly changing technology.

Relocation

A fourth variable, the financial, medical, or emotional need to relocate late in life (Botwinick, 1970; Bennett and Eckman, 1973), must now be considered. In spite of various psychological and psychiatric warnings about the inherent dangers of segregating the aged (Palmore, 1969; Lidz, 1968), sheer economics, in many instances, has necessitated that senior citizens relocate. Lidz suggested that, "the way of life of the elderly reflects the personality configurations established in earlier years, but it is greatly affected by how adaptive capacities are reduced by physical infirmities and mental limitations, as well as by the potentialities afforded by the society to persons as they age and become less able to manage for themselves (p. 493)."

Further he very eloquently argues against the process of segregation of the elderly by pointing to the following generative implications:

The aged person has passed the stage of being procreative and is often beyond creative, but the type of life he leads and is afforded by others will still profoundly influence those who
come after him. His welfare creates concern for his children and grandchildren. His presence in a child's home may cause disturbances and conflict that create stresses in the child's marriage and affect how his grandchildren are raised. He may serve as a beneficient figure for identification to grandchildren, and liaisons between grandparents and grandchildren frequently form important influences that convey traits and interests over an intervening generation. The way in which he leads his last years provides an example and a warning to his descendants and influences how they provide for their own later years. Further, how the old people are treated by their children commonly furnishes an illustration to grandchildren of how persons treat parents (p. 493).

Thus Lidz concludes that, "the aged may be close to the end of life, but the way in which they live and let live will continue to influence life (p. 493)." But he is quick to point out that although congregation of the elderly into special homes or communities has its shortcomings, it is a much better approach than exile into outmoded mental hospitals or bleak old age homes.

In light of the above, relocation can now be viewed as a major factor in the etiology of the disengagement process. Unfortunately, though, when senior citizens do relocate, it is not likely that they will turn to their children for assistance. Wake and Sporakowski (1972) report that seven out of every ten persons over 65 years of age do not live with their children. Though elderly people verbally state that they will rely on their children should the need arise, research has indicated that when the need does arise, they actually do not and, further, feel they should not turn to their children for help (Schorr, 1960; Shanas, 1958).

Not only are senior citizens reluctant to rely upon their children in times of crisis, Buckley (1972) has found that they are reluctant to seek out others as well. In suggesting that the elderly
needed to perceive themselves as strong and tended to deny weakness, Buckley concluded that "self-sufficiency was an important value in the culture of their younger days, so they tend to deny that they need the help of others, to keep their fears and feelings in the privacy of their own families—if not in their own hearts. They are caught by a cultural lag between their behavior patterns learned in the past and the problems presented to them by the world of today (p. 756)."

The need for educational intervention becomes more and more apparent. But before any such intervention is outlined, a clearer perspective of the various psychological approaches toward aging is necessary.

**Theoretical Approaches**

**Developmental**

Zubin (1973) stated, "You develop into aging just as you develop into childhood, adolescence, and adulthood (p. 5)." This appears to be the nucleus of most developmental thought.

The Cumming and Henry Disengagement Theory emerged primarily from a developmental approach to the problem. This theory has now been followed by Havighurst's Activity Theory which suggests that the maintenance of high levels of social interaction and other such activities contributes to successful aging. In both instances, the primary focus has been on the relationship of social disengagement to psychological well-being. According to Neugarten (1973) present developmental theory offers the following postulates:
1. Disengagement appears to be an accurate description of the social and psychological processes which occur as an individual passes from middle to old age.

2. Psychological disengagement appears to precede social disengagement and seems to have developmental properties.

3. Disengagement is generally viewed as an inadequate description of optimal or successful aging.

4. Patterns of aging seem to vary in direct relation to the social setting.

5. There seems to be a positive overall relationship between social engagement and life satisfaction.

Further, Neugarten (1973) suggests that present questions in the developmental literature focus on the following:

1. Whether or not steady decline in social engagement is, indeed, characteristic of aging.

2. Whether or not social disengagement is inevitable.

3. What patterns of social interaction may be found in different samples of older people.

4. Whether rates of change are generally the same.

5. What the limits of sociocultural and historical factors may be.

6. And, lastly, whether it is the relatively engaged or the relatively disengaged older person who is generally best off.

In supporting Glaser and Straus (1967), Neugarten purports that "for
the time being the developmentalist might do well to turn attention away from the global theories of personality and to focus on badly needed descriptive studies of adults, particularly those in which biological and social factors can be studied in relation to each other; those in which antecedent-consequent relationships can be clarified; and those from which grounded theory can be developed; in other words, studies aimed at discovery rather than confirmation and at theory that grows from, rather than precedes observation (p. 318)."

**Clinical**

"As the result of one's life history with its accumulating record of adaptations to both biological and social events, there is a continually changing basis with the individual for perceiving and responding to new events (Neugarten, 1973, p. 312)." This developmental concept is central to the personality theories of Bühler (1935, 1959), Jung (1933), Kuhlen (1964), Maslow (1954) and Rogers (1963) in which concepts of human growth, expansion, and actualization are emphasized as occurring throughout the life process.

More recently, the Kansas City Studies of Adult Life, carried out over the past fifteen years by the Committee on Human Development at the University of Chicago (Neugarten, 1973) have explored the changes in intrapsychic processes as an individual passes from middle to old age. Investigations of those processes (which include self concept, handling of life impulses and perception of self in relation to the environment) by Neugarten and Gutmann (1958) and Gutmann, Henry and Neugarten (1959) have shown a tendency to change from an active to a
more passive mode of living and from an outer-world toward a more inner-world orientation.

In addition to the above, cross-cultural studies by Gutmann (1964) and Neugarten and Gutmann (1958), employing the Thematic Apperception Test, support the concept of a continuum from active to passive to magical ego styles as occurring with age. Thus, the active-productive, passive-receptive, and magical-dreamer orientations are distributed more by age than by culture. Beside changes in ego orientation, Lieberman (1965) and Lieberman and Coplan (1969) found systematic changes occurring in both cognitive and affective processes in persons over 70; thus, supporting a developmental view of intrapsychic change.

As can be seen from the above, the developmental and clinical approaches toward aging are not mutually exclusive; and even when combined, they do not deal with two very important factors: the role of society and the strengths of the older person to learn new ways of coping with his environment.

In terms of psychotherapeutic intervention, the ground-breaking work was done by Dr. Lillien J. Martin, a psychologist, who founded the Old Age Counseling Center of San Francisco in 1929. Unfortunately, her approach did not have a great impact on the clinical psychology of the time. And even though the majority of her concepts are central to existing community mental health ideology, they have now become more ideology than reality as the majority of mental health professionals continue to avoid the elderly. Gottesman, Quarterman, and Cohn (1973) point out the reluctance that psychotherapists, especially
psychoanalytically-oriented psychotherapists, have in working with the elderly. Here, senior citizens are usually viewed as having less psychic energy, as being quite passive, anergic, and unchangeable. Also, they point to their slowing abilities in the areas of problem solving and learning new skills. This ideology can be directly traced to Sigmund Freud (Rechtschaffen, 1959) and even further to Plato.

More recently, this concept has stemmed from the fact that initially studies of the elderly originated in hospitals and nursing homes, where large groups of elderly people were more readily available (Berezin, 1972). However, research scientists have now turned their attention away from the hospitalized, less healthy senior citizen to his more active counterpart in the community (Nemeth, 1971; Nemeth and Fuselier, 1972; Riley and Forner, 1970; White, Riley, and Johnson, 1970). Berezin suggests the need to dispell the myth that old people are sick people and purports that Americans have developed a general gerontophobic attitude which incorporates the belief that old age itself is a disease. He further concludes that most of America's twenty million senior citizens, people who are 65 years of age or older, are "emotionally healthy persons who retain the same drives and ego operations that served them earlier (p. 33)." These senior citizens thus possess the same basic needs and desires as younger people. The only difference, therefore, is one of degree.

Psychotherapists are slowly coming around to this point of view, and Goldfarb (1955), Ross (1963) and others (Goldfarb and Turner, 1953; Goldfarb and Sheps, 1954) have suggested the mutual value
to the psychotherapist and the elderly person of a psychotherapeutic relationship. They again point to the senior citizen's amenability to change and capability of continued learning.

Behaviorists lend strong support to this view. In fact, Krasner (1971) is quick to point out that age per se will not limit the effectiveness of positive reinforcement, desensitization, aversive stimuli, and modeling—the four major techniques of behavior therapy.

Phenomenologists, psychoanalysts, and behaviorists seem to be quite in agreement on the following point: that an individual learns until he dies.

Perhaps it would be beneficial to examine variables which might interfere with the learning process as an individual enters old age. One of the most salient factors is depression. Busse and Pfeiffer (1969) point out that, "depression in old age is common and is generally based upon the loss of positive reinforcements rather than on guilt as is more common in younger people (p. 401)." This loss of positive reinforcements usually includes (1) failure or loss of support of family or friends, and (2) subtle or forced or chosen movement toward a more dependent, external style of living (Gottesman, et al., 1973).

The second most salient factor is anxiety. As defined by Busse and Pfeiffer (1969), anxiety is "a subjectively experienced state of dread anticipation in which the object of one's dread is only vaguely defined; the term also included the bodily manifestations of this uneasy mental state; muscular tenseness, restlessness, rapid heart rate,"
excessive sweating--all signs of preparedness for fight or flight (p. 196)." They suggest that anxiety in old age may not be situation-related or specific, but may be a more general problem of growing old. Further, Busse and Pfeiffer (1969), in pointing out that one of the most crucial needs is the development of methods of psychological intervention capable of reducing anxiety, concluded that

Actually, a certain amount of anxiety in a given situation can improve alertness and efficiency for coping. Even a certain amount of anger can promote readiness for action. However, when fear and anger become extreme or persistent, they tend to have a disorganizing effect on the adaptative efforts of the individual (p. 197).

This view is further supported by Murray (1971) who suggested that anxiety and behavior have a U-curve relationship. Thus, in regard to verbal productivity, he suggested that "increasing the level of anxiety from mild to moderate would raise productivity, but further increases to very high levels of anxiety would lower productivity (p. 244)."

Few methods have been advanced. In fact, Lawton (1973), in the most significant American Psychological Association publication on adult development and aging to date, pointed to the astonishing lack of the full development of a clinical psychology of aging including workable models for intervention. This supports Neugarten's (1973) contention that it is time to get out and experiment, rather than to sit around theorizing and then to gather data in support of the theory.

Social

The work of Birren, Butler, Greenhouse, Sokoloff and Yarrow (1963) and Reichard, Livson and Peterson (1962) clearly indicates that
such factors as work status, health, financial resources, and marital status are more decisive than chronological age in influencing degrees of adjustment in people over age 50. Here it has been shown that although changes along these dimensions are themselves age-associated, it appears that older people, like younger people, have differing capacities of coping with life stresses and of coming to terms with their life situations. Thus, chronological age alone is not the decisive factor.

The importance of the role played by an individual's social environment on his healthy adjustment to aging is slowly coming into focus. As Neugarten (1973) commented, "interaction patterns are obviously not a function of personality alone for no matter what the individual's makeup, he cannot achieve levels of social activity independent of the opportunities provided in the environment (p. 325)."

It appears that the importance of psychosocial interaction on the health and well-being of the individual is not just significant as he passes from middle to old age. In fact, this concept has long been central to community mental health ideology. As Glidewell (1966) stated:

The focus of attention in community mental health has been, and should continue to be, upon the psychosocial interaction between the individual and the small social organizations of which he is a member. The relevant dimensions of social organization are (1) emotional acceptance, (2) social power, (3) attributed competence, and (4) vulnerability to sanction. The relevant dimensions of individual behavior are psychosocial--(1) motivational, (2) emotional, (3) intellectual, (4) interpersonal. The biophysical and the socio-cultural, while often crucial, are nonetheless in the background for community mental health (p. 47).

As viewed in the above statement, theoretically, mental health
professionals are available to assist aging individuals. However, practically, this is not always the case. Nevertheless, Kramer, Taube and Redick (1973) suggest that socially-oriented programs in the community constitute the only major, viable alternative to institutionalization of the aged. They suggest the need to attend to the individual in his environment.

Gottesman, et al. (1973), pointing out that it is time for psychology to begin to go beyond man and into his world, propose the following alternative:

One need of the older people in America is for militant allies to help them achieve their self-determined goals by changing social systems if necessary. Such social treatment can include educating old people about the reality of the way social systems function, especially in relation to their needs, and about the options open to them for change (p. 396).

Learning

In discussing the learning abilities of older people, Rabbitt (1968) suggests that like early computers, older humans are slower and less efficient than newer models and that they suffer from a reduced information-handling capacity when dealing with multiple tasks. Perhaps this view is somewhat extreme, but it does not imply that older individuals cannot profit from experience. Studies by Canestrari (1963), Eisdorfer, Axelrod and Wilkie (1963), Hulicka and Weiss (1965), Arenberg (1965) and others have all concluded that with a little more available time, there is a great probability that the older person will learn. This led Eisdorfer to explore the concept of response inhibition. He found it to be an important variable in the apparent learning
difficulty of older people. Further, Eisdorfer (1969) found that under pressure an older person would most probably withhold his response.

Eisdorfer (1969) concluded that

To the extent that older persons inhibit their responses they may fail to develop appropriate stimulus-response reinforcers. Eisdorfer and Wilkie have indicated that aged individuals probably learn through a combined stimulus-response and cognitive approach (16). It would seem clear that responsiveness is needed in order to obtain appropriate environmental reinforcements which then provide further motivation to continue the learning process. A vicious spiral of withdrawal, negative feedback, and atrophy of function, followed by more withdrawal, might then be postulated. The relationships between initial withdrawal, subsequent withdrawal, and a declining physical condition are obviously very complex (p. 247).

In examining this relationship, Coleman (1963) attempted to modify the rigidity of geriatric patients through operant conditioning. He concluded that rigidity in the aged was not an irreversible phenomenon and could be modified or reduced by application of positive reinforcements. He thus encouraged the expansion of rehabilitative efforts with the elderly.

This research lends support to the findings of Baltes and Labouvie (1973) who conclude that

both the data on environmental (learning) and biological (maturational) intervention suggest that intellectual ontogeny is highly alterable, even during old age. Although previous fads have been to assign biological components a dominant role in controlling intelligence in the aged, preliminary analyses of the gerontological ecosystems strongly imply that the elderly live in environmental fields that are conspicuously deficient of contingencies that are conducive to intellectual acquisition and maintenance (p. 206).

They further suggest that the rapidity of cultural change necessitates a redistribution of educational efforts throughout the life span.
Discussion

Thus, the mutual dependence of developmental, clinical, social, and learning theories becomes very essential in the development of techniques designed to retard or reverse the disengagement process.

As these four approaches were combined in an overall effort to examine the process of continued engagement, as opposed to subtle disengagement, two critical factors emerged. Back and Gergen (1966) described these as follows: (1) the cognitive factor in which decisions must be made concerning the individual's effective life space or the extent of the world the person is willing to accept as relevant to his conduct, and (2) the motivational factor, or the amount of emotional investment the individual is willing to make in his environment. With the senior citizen, it must be recognized that this investment might necessarily be limited by the amount of energy that he is capable of expending. As Swenson (1972) suggested, the aging individual might need a little external stimulation in order to continue in the mainstream of life and avoid disengagement. Accordingly, Lidz (1968) suggests that many "may believe that very little can be done to help persons of advanced age with emotional or social problems. However, because many elderly persons expect so little and because their needs are limited, a great deal can often be accomplished briefly. Such efforts are not directed toward profound personality changes (pp. 489-490)." In this regard, the individuality of each senior citizen must not be overlooked. Nemeth and Fuselier (1972) point out the dangers of viewing the elderly as a homogeneous group. Braceland (1972)
supports this contention and further suggests the need for research focusing on the individual senior citizen and his potential for continued growth and development.

Further, Butler (Brine, 1970), in suggesting the need for continuing educational efforts throughout the life span, suggests that "perhaps the greatest danger in life is being frozen into a role that limits one's self-expression and development. We need Middle Starts and Late Starts as well as Head Starts (p. 53)." And, as the Duke University Center for the Study of Aging and Human Development concluded, the elderly do have the capacity to be involved in such a growth-oriented experience. Busse (Brine, 1970), Director of the Duke Center, noted that the ability of the elderly person to memorize and recall new information is good; however, on the average, this individual will need a little more time to absorb such information and react to it than will younger individuals.

Therefore, aging can be seen as a time of perceptual and behavioral slowing. However, Zubin (1961) points out that one of the most striking findings of Birren's research, using the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale to examine this slowing process, was the fact that the individual's storage capacity for memory increases with age. Therefore, while the physiological, sensory, perceptual, and psychomotor responsiveness of the individual which depends upon reception and encoding of immediate sensory input declines with age, the conceptual behavior which depends largely upon storage of information seems to maintain its high level throughout the old age period and sometimes
even increases in contrast with the level attained by younger individuals. Concurrently, Back and Gergen (1966) suggest that "withdrawal would seem to depend on the manner in which the person processes the information he receives. It is at this point that the person's orientation will have a great impact on the processing of information (p. 292)" and, therefore, the process of disengagement.

As can be seen from the above, recent psychological findings do not paint such a hopeless, dismal picture of the helpless senior citizen as has been portrayed by the mass media and such popular books as Simone de Beauvoir's The Coming of Age (1972). Rather, psychologists are now emphasizing the aging individual's capacity to cope and grow and develop as being continuous until death. This is consistent with such theoreticians as Jung and Erikson. In fact, many professionals (Kubler-Ross, 1969; Benson, 1972) are now recognizing the unique opportunity for growth that the process of preparing for death and dying affords an individual.

**Toward a Definition of Aging**

As Aring (1972) emphasized, the prescription for growing old should accent the growing rather than the aging. He sees this as the best deterrence to psychological senility. Here, biological theory has been of great assistance. Minot (1908) proposed that the rate of growth is the best measure of the vitality that diminishes steadily throughout life. He perceived life as growth, the retardation of growth as senescence, and cessation of growth as death. This view, which is still in prominence today, has assisted Aring, who has defined
senescence as the collective process of becoming old, in perceiving it as a normal psychobiological process and as the major alternative to senility.

Thus growing old can be conceptualized as more than a physical, biological process. Herrick's (1924) observation—you don't grow old; when you cease to grow you are old—seems so very applicable to the psychological process of aging. Yet unclear, though, is the relationship of behavioral changes due to aging to biological changes due to length of life (Birren, 1961). Research in this area is still forthcoming. However, behavioral scientists have attempted to define the process of aging with generalities. Such definitions though appear to be somewhat vague. For example, Birren has defined aging as a term used to designate the broad collection of changes which occur in adult organisms without necessarily implying regularity in these changes. A more sociologic approach was taken by Tibbitts and Donahue (1960) who describe aging as the survival of a growing number of people who have completed the traditional adult roles of making a living and child rearing.

**An Ecological Approach**

An examination of the various theoretical approaches—developmental, clinical, social, and learning—and an investigation of the need for more concise definitions led this author to adopt an ecological approach to the problem.

Here, a theoretical view of aging is conceptualized "in terms of the adaptation of man to his environment and his alteration of the
environment as a process of human adaptation (p. 619)." In offering the above definition, Lawton and Nahemow (1973) suggest that "the aging process itself can be seen as one of continual adaptation: adaptation both to the external environment and the changes in internal capabilities and functioning which takes place during the life cycle (pp. 619-620)." Therefore, aging is seen as a dynamic process in time and space. Thus Lawton and Nahemow "define the ecology of aging as a system of continual adaptations in which both the organism and the environment change over time in a nonrandom manner; either environment or the organism is capable of initiating a cycle of action, or of responding (p. 621)."

Here, behavior is expressed as a function of the organism and the environment, both of which have the capacity for change.

Unfortunately, the aging person's environment appears to be shrinking rather than expanding. Lawton and Nahemow (1973), in supporting Baltes' conclusions, stated that "the environmental resources offered by society are age graded: the aged are given less opportunity for learning new skills, while the continued practice of old skills may be rendered impossible (p. 623)."

**Laboratory Training as a Framework for Intervention**

A focus on the need to create learning opportunities throughout life and to do so in the aging individual's home environment becomes clear. Thus, a framework for research designed to assist the aging individual in adapting to intrapersonal, interpersonal, and environmental change employing laboratory training methodology is now
proposed. Though the application of the laboratory method to the adjustment problems of senior citizens has received little attention, this type of experiential learning, with its emphasis on increasing the effectiveness of individuals who are within a normal range of functioning, seems feasible. As Bradford, Gibb and Benne (1964) have stated, laboratory training, employing the use of group methodology, has been evaluated as an effective means of re-educating and re-involving individuals of various age groups who have experienced coping difficulties at one time or another. However, their review did not mention any use of this method with groups of individuals sixty-five years of age or older. To date, the author has found no reports of the application of the laboratory training method to assist senior citizens in dealing with the unique problems of growing old.

Definition

According to Lubin and Eddy (1972), "the laboratory training model refers to a range of experienced-based learning activities in which participants are centrally involved in goal setting, observing, feeding back, analyzing data, planning action or change steps, evaluating, etc. Data which are within the learning situation itself provide the material for learning (p. 820)." Lubin and Eddy point out that the best known form of the "laboratory" usually has the character of a conference or workshop.

Overview

Perhaps the most comprehensive overview of the laboratory
experience is offered by Benne (1964) who states that it consists of "different groupings of participants with differing technologies of training in the service of various learning objectives. Staff members are in continuous communication in order to establish and maintain relationships among the parts of the laboratory experience. As the laboratory proceeds in time, participants are brought together in integrating sessions designed to help them relate the parts of their overall laboratory experience. Integration of learnings becomes a central concern for participants in work on problems of application of laboratory learnings in their home situation (pp. 108-109)."

Assumptions

A variety of assumptions, dependent upon the purposes of the laboratory and the heterogeneity of individuals attending, usually underlies a laboratory training experience. However, five of the more credible, salient assumptions, as summarized by Lubin and Eddy (1972) are as follows: (1) the laboratory method legitimates feelings and facilitates experiencing, expressing, and examining the emotional aspects of communication; (2) the laboratory provides an opportunity for each participant to receive information about how his behavior is seen and to learn about his impact on others; (3) the laboratory sanctions, encourages, and provides opportunities for the practice and analysis of new behavior; (4) the laboratory, especially one with a group or organizational focus, can and does provide opportunities, both structured and unstructured, to learn about the many forces at work in groups and to study one's own performance in relation to these forces;
and (5) the experienced-based laboratory approach may help participants to operationalize their knowledge.

**Description of the Change Process**

Change is an explicit part of growth and, as such, one important function of laboratory training is to provide a setting in which this process has a high probability of occurring. As applied to the problems of senior citizens, laboratory training should involve the following processes: (1) change in the senior citizen's behavior in relation to his group, (2) change in the level of situational anxiety he experiences, and (3) change in the amount of control he feels he can exert over his own behavior.

A valued description of the process of change is that outlined by Kurt Lewin. In reference to attitude change, Schein and Bennis (1965) outline Lewin's description of change as occurring in the following three stages:

**Stage 1. Unfreezing.**

a. Lack of confirmation or disconfirmation.
b. Induction of guilt - anxiety.
c. Creation of psychological safety by reduction of threat or removal of barriers to change.

**Stage 2. Changing.**

a. Scanning the interpersonal environment.
b. Identifying with a model.

**Stage 3. Refreezing.**

a. Personal--integrating new responses into the
rest of the personality and attitude system.
b. Relational--integrating new responses into on-going significant relationships.

Schein and Bennis (1965) see the laboratory method as particularly facilitative to the above process.

Measurement

For the purpose of evaluation, measurement was considered essential. However, measurement with the elderly is an especially difficult process; therefore, a brief discussion of each measure and the reason for its inclusion in this study is presented below. Information obtained from two previous studies, Nemeth (1971) and Nemeth and Fuselier (1972) revealed the importance of (1) keeping all measures fairly short (e.g., under thirty minutes) and (2) choosing measures that were simple and practical (e.g., measures which could be used with individuals who had only a few years of formal education).

The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientations--Behavior (FIRO-B)

It was considered necessary to employ a measure of interpersonal behavior in group settings in order to assess whether the process of change could actually occur among senior citizens who engaged in a weekend laboratory training experience.

Schutz (1960) introduced the concept of interpersonal orientations in conjunction with both a theory of interpersonal behavior and a test (the FIRO-B) designed to measure the dimensions of Inclusion, Control, and Affection. Each of these three dimensions of the FIRO-B yield separate indices of the person's professed level of behavior.
(called Expressed, as in Expressed Affection) and of his professed desire to receive such behavior (called Wanted, as in Wanted Affection). Thus, the FIRO-B yields six separate indices: FB1, Expressed Inclusion; FB2, Expressed Control; FB3, Expressed Affection; FB4, Wanted Inclusion; FB5, Wanted Control; and FB6, Wanted Affection.

Further, Smith (1964) demonstrated statistically reliable relationships between FIRO-B scores and ratings of overt behavior and Jacobson and Smith (1972) have expressed that validation literature reveals some evidence that FIRO-B scores do relate to behavior. Upon that basis, they employed the FIRO-B in their effort to examine the effects of a weekend group experience upon the interpersonal orientations of the group members.

*The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI)*

Further, there is considerable evidence (Spielberger, 1966) that anxiety is involved in the manner in which individuals relate to and handle new experiences. Therefore, a measure of anxiety was sought. In designing the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory or STAI, Spielberger and Gorsuch (1966) built upon the works of Freud (1933, 1936), Cattell and Sheier (1961), and Spence (1964), and examined the concept of anxiety in terms of the relationship between two specific anxiety constructs--State Anxiety and Trait Anxiety. He defined State Anxiety (A-state) as consisting of subjective feelings of apprehension, tension, and concern and heightened autonomic nervous system activity. Whereas Trait Anxiety (A-trait) was seen as referring to anxiety
proneness—specifically, to individual differences in the disposition to respond with high levels of A-state under stressful circumstances (Hodges and Spielberger, 1969). Thus, the STAI is divided into two separate parts, with one (form X-1) measuring State Anxiety and the other (form X-2) measuring Trait Anxiety.

The Internal-External Control Scale (I-E Scale)

Feather (1967) suggested that externally-oriented individuals exhibited a greater amount of anxiety than did internally-oriented individuals. Further, it was suggested that excessive anxiety tended to disrupt or interfere with the learning process (Busse and Pfeiffer, 1969). This was seen as an important factor in the design of this experiment, since a review of the literature had revealed a perceived loss of control as accompanying the aging process. Therefore, a measure of locus-of-control was sought.

Rotter (1966) has described an internally-oriented individual as believing that reinforcements are contingent upon certain aspects of his behavior, such as competence and skill; while, conversely, the externally-oriented individual believes that such reinforcements are determined by forces independent of his own behavior, such as fate, chance, luck or other individuals.

The concept of internal versus external control as a criterion of social behavior is based upon Rotter's (1954) concept of social learning theory. Rotter hypothesized that a person's expectations concerning the functional relationships between behavioral events and reinforcing events are a product of that person's previous experiences
with reinforcing events. Rotter (1966), Lefcourt (1966) and Williams and Nickels (1969) have shown that differences in behavior are related to an individual's locus-of-control. This research has been substantiated by Williams and Stack (1972) who suggest that the Rotter Internal-External Control Scale (I-E Scale) offers further insight into the behavioral change process. Thus, the I-E Scale offers a range of indices of internal control as indicated by scoring on the lower end of the continuum and a range of indices of external control, as indicated by scoring on the higher end of the continuum.

Summary

Since there was some question as to the feasibility of the use of the Rotter I-E Scale and the Spielberger STAI due to the lack of norms for a senior citizen population, the authors were personally consulted. They offered no objections; therefore, based upon the brevity, simplicity, and straightforwardness of these two measures the author made the decision to employ them in the design of this experiment. The Schutz FIRO-B—being a fairly well established, practical method of assessing the orientation of a person's behavior as affected by a group experience—was also included in the present design.

Project Review

The present line of investigation was a culmination of a tripartite research project which extended over a three year period. The purposes of the aforementioned project were three-fold:
1. The XYZ Study—to explore a group of senior citizens who were functioning at an engaged level in their community in order to determine the natural limitations of social engagement for senior citizens.

2. The Resident Group Differences Study—to develop an interview and a systematic measure of behavior which would serve as a method of determining which individuals or group of individuals would be most able to benefit from participatory techniques designed to retard or reverse the disengagement process.

3. The Present Study—to develop an experiential learning approach capable of retarding or reversing the disengagement process that would be both feasible and practical.

Being that the third segment of this research effort was based upon the results of the XYZ Study (Nemeth, 1971) and the Resident Group Differences Study (Nemeth and Fuselier, 1972), a thorough discussion of the information obtained from the aforementioned studies will now be presented.

The XYZ Study

This first investigation (Nemeth, 1971) served as a pilot study for the entire project. During a three-month period, members of the XYZ Club of the First Methodist Church in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, were interviewed in order to determine the interests, attitudes, and behavior of a group of senior citizens who functioned at an engaged level in their community.
A Modified Minimal Social Behavior Scale (MMSBS) adapted from Ulmer and Timmons (1964) was used to determine level of social engagement. Here the possible range of MMSBS scores was from 0 to 30. The mean score obtained by this group of senior citizens was 28.33, indicating a high level of social engagement. The MMSBS was interspersed with two other data gathering instruments, a Gerontological Interest Questionnaire (GIQ) and an Attitudinal Sentence Completion Form (ASCF). The entire interview may be found in Appendix A. The GIQ and the ASCF were especially designed with an open-ended approach, thus allowing interviewees to determine the amount of information they chose to share.

The above process revealed the following information:

1. Socially engaged senior citizens left their homes or residences four or more times a week in order to take part in community activities or to see to their own needs.

2. Closeness with families appeared to be more a function of lifelong family patterns of interaction than a function of disengagement.

3. Socially engaged senior citizens who were not close to their families (either geographically or interpersonally or both) managed to seek out others and to endeavor to form meaningful relationships. This factor seemed to increase with age.

4. Though these senior citizens regarded themselves as active, they tended to shy away from surface club work or relationships. It appeared that these individuals wanted to put
whatever energies they had into meaningful endeavors. Further, they were quite explicit about not wanting to become involved in passive events such as bingo playing or watching daytime television.

5. Engaged senior citizens perceived themselves as being in good health and did not dwell on health problems.

6. Lack of personal or adequate public transportation did not seem to deter these senior citizens from meeting their social obligations or from seeing to their own personal needs.

7. These engaged senior citizens still took a strong interest in the politics of their community and reported voting regularly. In fact, public apathy, crooked politicians, and lack of civic pride were the three main objections voiced by this group.

8. Lastly, these individuals said that they were willing to help their community in any way possible (except for political campaigning). However, they sadly reported that their involvement was rarely sought.

In the above process, the MMSBS appeared to be an effective measure of level of social engagement. However, the GIQ and the ASCF, even though yielding a wealth of information, were found to be too lengthy to administer in a selection battery. The average length of an interview, with the aforementioned open-ended data gathering forms, ran two and a half to three hours.
However, this investigation supported the need to further explore senior citizens in light of a continuum from engagement to disengagement and to determine where individuals or groups of individuals were on this continuum before developing further plans and programs for the elderly.

The Resident Group Differences Study

In response to the aforementioned need, a second study (Nemeth and Fuselier, 1972) was designed in an attempt to examine three resident groups of senior citizens in Baton Rouge, Louisiana (two housing projects, Southern Colonial and Turner Plaza, and one nursing home, Guest House) in order to determine where they would fall on an engagement-disengagement continuum. An abbreviated form of the MMSBS was employed. Here the range was from 0 - 18. However, on the basis of information gathered in the aforementioned study, it was determined that a more expedient interview, which would yield an equivalent amount of information but could be administered in a time range of from twenty minutes to one hour, was needed. A Biographical Data Inventory (BDI), based on the work of Cassens and Schmuckler (Schmuckler, 1966), was then developed. The complete interview, including the MMSBS and the BDI, may be found in Appendix B. This interview was administered over a five-month period to the following resident groups of senior citizens: (1) A racially-mixed group living in a newly opened housing project (Turner Plaza), (2) An all-white group living in a housing project which had been opened for six months (Southern Colonial), and (3) An all-white group living in a private nursing home (Guest House).
It was concluded that specific differences due to extreme age and due to race appeared to have a noticeable effect on the disengagement process. A further analysis revealed the following information:

1. Residents of both housing projects scored significantly higher on the MMSBS scale as indicated by the results of a Kruskal-Wallace one-way analysis of variance for ranks. The median scores for nursing home residents were significantly lower, indicating a strong level of social disengagement. However, an interesting phenomenon occurred at Guest House. The MMSBS data was gathered in two parts—pre-interview and post-interview. The median score on the pre-interview section for Guest House residents was 4.5, whereas that on the post-interview section increased to 6.5, indicating an increase in level of social engagement apparently due to the interviewing process (t test = 4.0, highly significant at the .0001 level).

2. In a comparison of residents of Guest House versus residents of Southern Colonial and Turner Plaza, differences due to extreme age became apparent (e.g., Guest House residents hardly ever left the nursing home). However, it was interesting to note that the Guest House residents perceived themselves as being much older than they really were, whereas residents of Turner Plaza and Southern Colonial still perceived themselves as being middle-aged.

3. Strong differences in financial background were found to
exist between residents of Turner Plaza (the racially-mixed housing project) and residents of Southern Colonial (the all-white housing project).

4. Black residents at Turner Plaza reported reluctance in making new friends and, although there were no racial differences as to the number of social gatherings attended, there were strong indications that Black residents may not have had the same socialization opportunities in their earlier lives that the White residents had and, therefore, they might now need some assistance in developing a "social self."

5. The following criterion was established for social engagement. If an individual left his place of residence three or more times a week to venture into the community to see to his own needs and obligations, he was determined to be socially engaged. If he ventured forth less than three times a week, he was considered to be semi-engaged. And if he did not leave his place of residence during the course of a week, he was determined to be disengaged. Therefore, though residents of Turner Plaza and Southern Colonial scored high on the MMSBS, interview data revealed that these individuals did not leave their apartments three or more times a week. Thus, they were determined to be semi-engaged. Residents at Guest House rarely left the nursing home and were, therefore,
determined to be disengaged. The above results indicated a need to return to the full MMSBS (0-30) as employed in the XYZ study (Nemeth, 1971). It was determined to be a better predictor of social engagement than the shortened form employed in this study.

6. It was apparent that Guest House residents had the least opportunity for social interaction, due to age, health, and a lack of social stimulation. However, a short interviewing process seemed to reinstate, to a small degree, some habitual social patterns. Therefore, it was concluded that even in the most disengaged group of senior citizens, interpersonal experience could be effective in stimulating the use of previously learned patterns of social interaction.

7. In order to minimize the racial differences at Turner Plaza, it was suggested that activities be planned based on creative potential, rather than educational background, thus allowing both groups to feel a sense of pride from mutual endeavors.

8. Both Southern Colonial and Turner Plaza were new complexes, the former having been opened for six months and the latter having just been opened. What emerged in both settings was an apparent reluctance to get acquainted with one’s neighbors. This was especially surprising at Southern Colonial. Many residents expressed feelings of
loneliness, but, at the same time, expressed fear of or reluctance to reaching out to others.

The need for social intervention became apparent. Southern Colonial was chosen as an optimal setting for such intervention. Here the variables of race and of extreme age would not play an important factor thus clouding the real issue--to determine whether an experiential, interpersonal laboratory training approach could assist in retarding or reversing the disengagement process.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the effects of an experiential, interpersonal setting on the attitudes and behaviors of a group of senior citizens. Specifically, the intention was to determine if laboratory training could effectively retard or reverse the disengagement process.¹

This investigation was designed under the following premises:

1) that an individual senior citizen's behavior was amenable to change;

2) that change could occur in a short-term interpersonal experiential setting; and

¹This project became a reality through the tireless efforts of the following individuals: Dr. Edwin O. Timmons, Dr. Donald D. Glad, Dr. G. Dwayne Fuselier, Mrs. Mary Stewart O'Callaghan, Mr. James Gay, Mr. Scott Gordon, Dr. Lynn Bush, Dr. Michael Levine and Mrs. June Holly. All research in this tri-partite investigation was conducted under the auspices of the Department of Psychology at Louisiana State University and was funded, in part, by the Louisiana Commission on Aging.
3) that three specific measures--the FIRO-B, the STAI, and the I-E Scales--could serve as effective indices of behavioral change.
METHODS

Overview

Being that this research effort employed the use of laboratory training techniques, yielding experiential data, along with three measures of behavioral change, yielding statistical data, the necessity of presenting a precise account of both methodologies seemed readily apparent. Therefore, the following sections have been included:

1) Subjects
2) Setting
3) Staff
4) Instruments
5) Assessment Procedure
6) Laboratory Design
7) Laboratory Procedure
8) Statistical Analysis.

Subjects

Ss were 35 senior citizens living in the Southern Colonial Apartment Complex for the Elderly in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Seven (20%) were male and 28 (80%) female. Ss ranged in age from 60 to 83, with a mean age of 70.4. Only two Ss were under 65 years of age. All were white, retired, relocated senior citizens and all but two were widowed. All Ss had been screened for this project via participation in a previous study (Nemeth and Fuselier, 1972) in which these 35 randomly selected individuals were interviewed in an effort to assess their degree of disengagement and their amenability to change. This procedure revealed a socio-economic profile descriptive of the
majority of Southern Colonial residents. It is as follows:

1. Educational level--grade school or less.
2. Living arrangements over the past five years--lived alone.
3. Background--childhood, rural or small town; adulthood, urban.
4. Class--middle to upper-lower class.
5. Employment record--held at least four different jobs during the working years.
6. Perceptual data--past accomplishments, received an adequate amount of recognition; present health, good.
7. Social data--time away from home--less than 2 hours each day; opportunities to interact with young people--none; participation in clubs or organizations--none; voting pattern--regular; transportation problems--not major.

**Setting**

The laboratory setting was a three-day weekend workshop held in the Recreation Building at the Southern Colonial Complex. At the time the workshop took place (March, 1971), the Southern Colonial Complex had only been in operation for six months. Sessions were held from 2:30 to 5:00 p.m. on each of three consecutive days (Friday, Saturday, and Sunday). The laboratory progressed from an organizational to an interpersonal to an intrapersonal focus.

**Staff**

A consultant, June Holly, was invited from the Southwest Institute for Personal and Organizational Development (SIPOD) center in Houston, Texas to serve as Dean of the laboratory. Two licensed clinical psychologists, Drs. Donald D. Glad and Edwin O. Timmons, of
the Department of Psychology Faculty at Louisiana State University, served alternately as Consultant-Trainers and clinical backup resources. Two doctoral candidates in the L.S.U. Department of Psychology, Mr. Mike Levine and Mr. Lynn Bush, served as Trainers. The author functioned as Lab Manager. All the above staff members were active members of SIPOD. Three students, one master's candidate in psychology, Mr. Scott Gordon, and two senior undergraduates, Mr. James Gay and Mrs. Mary O'Callaghan, were involved as Facilitators.

**Instruments**

Instruments employed were a 54-item FIRO-B (Schutz, 1960), a 29-item I-E Scale (Rotter, 1966), and a 40-item STAI, forms X-1 (A-state) and X-2 (A-trait), Spielberger and Gorsuch (1966). These measures were used in order to assess the following nine dependent variables—Expressed Inclusion, Expressed Control, Expressed Affection, Wanted Inclusion, Wanted Control, Wanted Affection, Locus-of-Control, State Anxiety and Trait Anxiety.

**Assessment Procedure**

A total of 35 Ss, randomly selected from the occupancy list of the Southern Colonial Apartment Complex, were interviewed in order to gather biographical, attitudinal, and behavioral information on senior citizens (Nemeth and Fuselier, 1972). On the basis of the above information, these individuals were selected to participate in a laboratory training workshop. From this list, 8 Ss were randomly selected for a control group; that is, they were asked to participate in the
data-gathering process without being involved in the actual laboratory experience. These S's will be referred to as either Non-lab participants or as the Control group. Of the remaining 27 S's, three were unable to participate due to illness. Thus, 24 S's were invited to attend the three-day laboratory training workshop. If an individual accepted the invitation, it was agreed that he would attend at least two of the three sessions; however, each person was strongly encouraged to participate in all three sessions.

All S's were given the I-E Scale and the FIRO-B during the four-day period immediately prior to the lab. During that time, each instrument was individually administered to each S in a one-to-one situation at his place of residence. The STAI, including forms X-1 and X-2, was administered to all lab participants directly before the lab began on Friday. Early that morning, the STAI was administered to all non-lab participants.

Immediately following the end of the lab on Sunday, both sections of the STAI (forms X-1 and X-2), were again administered to all lab participants. Later that evening, it was administered to all non-lab participants. All S's were again given the I-E Scale and the FIRO-B during the four day period immediately following the lab.

Laboratory Design

The program for the lab, which was continuously up-dated to meet the needs of the individual participants, began with an organizational development focus. The Friday afternoon session included the following thirty minute activities:
I. Getting acquainted with self and others as a basis for organizing activities.

"Match-maker."

II. Developing Fun-task groups.

III. Identifying issues.

IV. Assessing problems and resources via a Force Field Analysis.

V. Sharing problems and resources.

The lab staff met Friday evening in order to debrief and to redirect Saturday's agenda. From the events of Friday afternoon, it was apparent that a less concrete, more creative experience was necessary. A Country Fair theme was chosen. The Saturday afternoon session included the following:

I. Summary of Friday.

Where are we now?

IIa. Pair and Share.

Get Acquainted.

b. Pair and Pair and Share.

Why "we" or "us"?

c. Quartet and Quartet and Share.

What a group!

III. Country Fair.

"Things go better."

a. Planning

b. Share with other groups.
The lab staff met again Saturday evening in order to debrief and finalize plans for Sunday's agenda and the close of the lab. As the participants were learning about their effectiveness and strengths in groups, they were also learning new things about themselves. It was decided to focus on this learning in the Sunday session. The Sunday afternoon session included the following:

30' I. Introduction to the Day.
"Warm-up."
  a. Pairs (teams).
  b. Talking a new way.

30' II. Our community.
Expressing in yet another way.

30' III. Sharing with the total group.
What I learned about "us."

30' IV. Summary and Feedback.
What I learned about "me."

30' V. Au Revoir.

A two hour staff debriefing session was held Sunday evening immediately following the lab. Staff members who were unable to be present were invited to express their feelings about the laboratory experience directly to the Lab Manager.
Laboratory Procedure

Each of the three afternoon laboratory training sessions had a specific focus. Friday afternoon was centered around the concept of organizational development. On Saturday, a more interpersonal theme evolved. And on Sunday, the focus was on intrapersonal growth. The following is a recapitulation of the experiences which occurred on those three days:

**Friday:** In getting acquainted, the participants were asked to share information about themselves with others. Specifically, they were asked to mill for a short time while making the following four decisions:

1. **How do I feel?**
   a. anxious
   b. relaxed
   c. frustrated
   d. cool

2. **What kind of person am I?**
   a. reserved
   b. involved
   c. social
   d. influencer

3. **What is my main concern?**
   a. church
   b. housing
   c. recreation
   d. other
4. How can I help?
   a. influencer
   b. helper
   c. follower
   d. organizer

After each question was pondered, participants were asked to discontinue their milling and to share their decision with others by grouping behind a specific alternative which was written on a piece of news print of the floor (Plates 1-4).

When participants had completed the above process, they were asked to form task groups on the basis of the above information. At this point, an air of creative ambiguity permeated the lab. The purpose of this approach was to allow the individual participant to get in touch with both the excitement and the creativity involved in working with others in a task-group setting. Therefore, the focus was changed from "developing task groups" to "developing fun-task groups."

At this point, Don Glad, who served in a dual capacity as a trainer and as a clinical back-up resource, presented a short lecturette on various approaches toward identifying issues and assessing problems and resources. This was a lead-in to the Force Field Analysis Exercise.

Participants chose to divide up on the dimensions of influencer, helper, follower, and organizer. In that process, the four groups each selected a very concrete task on which to work. The four tasks were as follows:
Plate 1: How Do I Feel?
Plate 2: What Kind of Person Am I?
Plate 3: What is My Main Concern?
Plate 4: How Can I Help?
1. How to get the recreation building open full time with dime cokes, rather than fifteen cent cokes, and how to obtain washing machines that worked.

2. How to get screen doors, gutters, and vents for the complex.

3. How to get something done about the excess water that accumulates after a rainfall (e.g., the need for a lawn, plants, and gutters).

4. How to get aluminum screen doors with latches for each individual apartment.

Each group identified the positive and negative factors involved and tried to determine which of those factors were amenable to change. The three facilitators (Jim Gay, Scott Gordon, and Mary O'Callaghan) and the lab manager (Darlyne Nemeth) each joined one group in order to serve as a participant-observer.

Throughout the afternoon, participants struggled with their feelings of powerlessness and their desire to have someone else take responsibility for seeing that changes were made. During this process, they were able to get in touch with the fact that they were all they had and that they would have to rely on their own strengths and resources. What ensued was a shift from reliance on the trainers and facilitators to a testing out of the various strengths and abilities that they each possessed.

At the end of this period, the groups were asked to come together to process their experiences and to share their tasks, plans, and recommendations with the total community. In each instance, a
group leader had emerged and was asked to serve as group reporter. This was the first total community sharing in the lab.

Throughout the community sharing, Don Glad listened to the reporters and began to structure an overall Force Field Analysis for the community. Here the most positive and most negative features of the Southern Colonial Complex were outlined and explored (Plate 5). The community then took the opportunity to identify the items which were most amenable to change and to explore the resources they had among themselves to bring about change.

In closing the Friday afternoon session, the community focused on the strengths of the Southern Colonial Complex and the various ways in which they could add more positive items to the list. This experience led into a short debriefing session during which members were asked to share what they had learned or experienced.

**Saturday:** Lynn Bush and Mike Levine served as co-trainers for this afternoon session. Lynn asked the participants to again form a community group in order to share with one another their memories of Friday. Afterward, he invited the lab participants to choose partners—to choose someone they didn't know or someone they didn't know well and to then share with that partner how and why the selection process was made. The first pairing was the most difficult, but forming quartets and octets flowed more easily, especially as sharing feelings and giving feedback became both legitimized and encouraged.

Four new groups were formed, and members again anticipated dealing with the concrete tasks that they had left on Friday. To their
Plate 5: Force Field Analysis

Part A - Analysis

Things Going Against Us:
1. Poor lighting, heaters, and ceiling
2. Dirt
3. Bugs
4. Heat
5. Hard to regulate

Resources Needed:
1. Manager to take complaints
2. Library
3. Screen doors
4. Bathtubs
5. Food transportation
6. Laundry facilities

Part B - Summary

Most Positive
- Comfortable
- Available
- Shopping
- Friendly neighbors
- Marquard's prices
- Good ice
- Room

Most Negative
- Ram problems
- Light problems
- Need Manager
- Need screen doors
- Need transportation
- Improved laundry facilities

Most Negative
- Most physical
- Food
- Social
- 11 except one is around physical facilities

One is management
surprise, Mike Levine asked them to take a trip with him to a "Country Fair." Since he had never been to one before, he asked the participants to tell him what to expect. Each group was asked to create one aspect of a country fair and then to share their ideas with the overall community. As the four individual groups came together to share and integrate their part of the country fair into the overall scheme, another community group was formed and a feeling of community began to emerge (Plate 6). Participants then rejoined their groups for feedback and processing. During this experience, they began to explore their own interpersonal strengths and weaknesses and to get in touch with the creative resources within themselves. In this process, group members were asked the following questions:

1. Who talked the most?
2. Who talked the least?
3. Who stirred things up?
4. Who calmed things down?
5. Who helped the most?
6. How did my group go?
7. What did I learn about others? Myself?

The following were typical responses to question seven:
1. "I did something in front of everybody and people liked me."
2. "People enjoyed talking with me."
3. "I like working in groups."
4. "I know how to lead, but I found out today that I could be a good follower, too."
Plate 6: Country Fair
5. "I thought I was too bold, but nobody agreed with me."

6. "The group gave me confidence."

**Sunday:** The briskness of the day and the fact that it was Sunday did have a visible effect on the participants. For example, participants were dressed in their Sunday best, and, therefore, reacted accordingly. In attempting to get in touch with where the lab participants were and in assisting them in communicating their feelings to one another, June Holly, Lab Director, asked the participants to introduce themselves to the day in an experiential way. She presented a series of non-verbal exercises which were intended to assist participants in exploring various forms of non-verbal communication. Participants were asked to stretch and to reach out to one another in ways that they had not done before. This was an opportunity for each person to get in touch with his own body language. Participants were invited to pair off once again, and through primary use of their eyes and hands, they were asked to explore, to share and to communicate with one another. Each participant was then asked to give his partner feedback in terms of what he felt was communicated and shared. Participants were surprised at how much they were able to say without words.

This experience created a very special feeling within the laboratory community. Again, June Holly asked if they might be willing to share their feelings in yet another way. Via magic markers and a long roll of white freezer paper, members were asked to express how they saw themselves in relationship to the entire laboratory community (Plate 7).
Plate 7: An Expression of Community
Plate 7 (Continued)
Plate 7 (Continued)
Plate 7 (Continued)
Plate 7 (Continued)
The majority of the afternoon was spent in sharing with the total community. Here participants had an opportunity to further explain their contributions to the group mural. This led to a process of sharing feelings about self, feelings about the laboratory experience, and feelings about the future. Past experiences were drawn upon to give added meaning and strength to the above as several participants attempted to share, via newsprint and magic markers, where they intended to go from here.

During a short break participants continued to process. This procedure resulted in the natural formation of two groups. These groups were continued as planning groups after the break.

The first group focused on the need for continued interpersonal communication between the residents of the five buildings at Southern Colonial by suggesting that they build paths across the large field which separated them (Plate 8). This was offered as both a symbolic and a concrete proposal. It was especially noted that this group suggested the need to build more paths not only within the complex, but out of the complex, thus re-connecting the complex and themselves with the outside world.

The second group saw a way to connect themselves to each other via planting flowers and trees and having a good lawn put in which everyone could enjoy. This group mainly concentrated on ways of developing themselves and beautifying their surroundings as if to say, "Welcome to my world (Plate 9)."

In a final community sharing process, where each person had an
Plate 8: Building Paths
Plate 9: Planting Flowers
opportunity to share any special feeling or wish that he or she had for another participant or staff member, the total community made the decision to say, "Au Revoir"—"Until we see each other again," rather than "goodbye."

**Statistical Analysis**

A simple analysis of variance with repeated measures (time) was used to test differences among groups (experimental and control) across time (pre and post). There was a separate analysis for each of the nine dependent measures. (See Tables 1-9 for sources of variation and degrees of freedom.) All possible correlations were examined by use of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (Hays, 1963).

---

1Dr. Prentiss Schilling and Dr. G. Dwayne Fuselier were of great assistance in the development of this design.
RESULTS

Statistical

Nine dependent measures—including Internal-External Control, State Anxiety, Trait Anxiety, and the six sub-tests of the FIRO-B—were gathered for each subject both before and after the laboratory training weekend workshop and a separate analysis of variance was run on each measure. The source tables for each of the analyses may be found in Tables 1-9. Raw scores attained by each subject may be found in Appendix C.

Of the nine analyses, significant results were found in the following three:

1. State Anxiety—as indicated by the significant group by time interaction (Table 2), a significant change in State Anxiety due to treatment was found for the Experimental Group. Specifically, there was a significant reduction in State Anxiety for the Experimental Group; whereas, no such reduction occurred in the Control Group. Further, as evidenced by the significant time main effect, a significant change occurred in State Anxiety for both groups due to time alone.

2. Trait Anxiety—again, a significant group by time interaction was found (Table 3). Specifically, there was a significant reduction in Trait Anxiety due to treatment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects/Group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>2.84 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F .01 (1,30) = 7.56
F .05 (1,30) = 4.17
### TABLE 2
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: STATE ANXIETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120.33</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects/Group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>174.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130.02</td>
<td>7.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.33</td>
<td>4.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* **p >.01
  * p >.05
TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: TRAIT ANXIETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects/Group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>160.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.33</td>
<td>7.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.08</td>
<td>5.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p > .01
*p > .05
TABLE 4
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: FB1 -- EXPRESSED INCLUSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects/Group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.49^N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F .01 (1,30) = 7.56
F .05 (1,30) = 4.17
### TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: FB2 -- EXPRESSED CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects/Group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.61 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F .01 (1,30) = 7.56
F .05 (1,30) = 4.17
### TABLE 6
**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: FB3 -- EXPRESSED AFFECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects/Group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.36 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>3.07 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F .01 (1,30) = 7.56
F .05 (1,30) = 4.17
### TABLE 7

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: FB4 -- WANTED INCLUSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects/Group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>1.73N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F .01 (1,30) = 7.56
F .05 (1,30) = 4.17
TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: FB5 -- WANTED CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects/Group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.29 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F .01 (1,30) = 7.56
F .05 (1,30) = 4.17
### TABLE 9

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: FB6 -- WANTED AFFECTION**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects/Group</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

**p > .01**
for the Experimental Group, while no such reduction was evidenced in the Control Group. Here, again a significant change in Trait Anxiety was found in both groups due to time alone.

3. Wanted Affection (FB6)--here a significant group by time interaction showed a significant change due to treatment for the Experimental Group. This change was in the direction of a reduction in Wanted Affection for the Experimental Group; whereas no such reduction appeared in the Control Group (Table 9).

At this point, it should be noted that there were no group differences indicated by any of the nine dependent measures.

The above results can be more clearly illustrated by individual comparisons of the pre- and post-test means on the nine variables for the experimental group and for the control group. As can be seen in Table 10, the changes of the means on State Anxiety, Trait Anxiety, Wanted Affection and Internal-External Control merit closer examination.

By conducting t tests, with the standard error of the difference based on the residual mean square for error b in the analysis of variance, on the differences in the means of the experimental and control groups on the aforementioned variables, the following results were ascertained:

1. State Anxiety: The difference in the means of the experimental group showed a significant reduction from pre- to post-testing (p > .001), while no such difference was obtained for the control group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Internal-External Control</th>
<th>State Anxiety</th>
<th>Trait Anxiety</th>
<th>FB1 Expressed Inclusion</th>
<th>FB2 Expressed Control</th>
<th>FB3 Expressed Affection</th>
<th>FB4 Wanted Inclusion</th>
<th>FB5 Wanted Control</th>
<th>FB6 Wanted Affection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>36.13</td>
<td>39.92</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>30.17</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>39.38</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Trait Anxiety: The difference in the means of the experimental group showed a significant reduction from pre- to post-testing \((p > .01)\), while no such difference was obtained for the control group.

3. Wanted Affection: The difference in the means of the experimental group again showed a significant reduction from pre- to post-testing \((p > .05)\); here, no significant difference was obtained for the control group.

4. Internal-External Control: It is important to note that although changes of the I-E means did not reach significance in the analysis of variance, planned individual comparisons using a \(t\) test showed a significant \((p > .001)\) movement toward internal control following treatment; whereas, no such movement was evident in the control group.

Tables 11-14 and Graphs 1-4 illustrate these results.

No known norms are available for senior citizens on the State and Trait Anxiety measures, for Spielberger, Gorsuch, and Lushene (1969) only published norms for college freshmen, undergraduates, and high school students. Table 15 is a comparison of the means of these samples with the means of the group, time, and group by time interaction of this sample of senior citizens. As can be seen, there were no gross differences between the Spielberger norms drawn from adolescents and young adults and the means obtained from this sample of senior citizens. It is interesting to note, however, that the range of means
TABLE 11

*t TESTS FOR STATE ANXIETY MEANS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E₁ vs E₂*</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>&gt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁ vs C₂**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Necessary levels of significance
* .05 = 2.1
** .05 = 7.7

E₁ (experimental pre test)
E₂ (experimental post test)
C₁ (control pre test)
C₂ (control post test)
### TABLE 12

**t TESTS FOR TRAIT ANXIETY MEANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E₁ vs E₂*</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>&gt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁ vs C₂**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Necessary levels of significance

* .05 = 2.1
** .05 = 7.7

E₁ (experimental pre test)
E₂ (experimental post test)
C₁ (control pre test)
C₂ (control post test)
TABLE 13

**t TESTS FOR FB6 (WANTED AFFECTION)**

**MEANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_1$ vs $E_2^*$</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_1$ vs $C_2^{**}$</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Necessary levels of significance**

*- .05 = 2.1
**.05 = 7.7

$E_1$ (experimental pre test)
$E_2$ (experimental post test)
$C_1$ (control pre test)
$C_2$ (control post test)
### TABLE 14

**t TESTS FOR INTERNAL-EXTERNAL CONTROL MEANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_1$ vs $E_2^*$</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>&gt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_1$ vs $C_2^{**}$</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Necessary levels of significance*

* $0.05 = 2.1$
** $0.05 = 7.7$

$E_1$ (experimental pre test)
$E_2$ (experimental post test)
$C_1$ (control pre test)
$C_2$ (control post test)
Graph 1: Mean Differences on State Anxiety Due to Treatment

TIME 1

TIME 2

Experimental Group

Control Group
Graph 2: Mean Differences on Trait Anxiety Due to Treatment
Graph 3: Mean Differences on FB6 (Wanted Affection) Due to Treatment
Graph 4: Mean Differences on Internal-External Control Due to Treatment
TABLE 15

A COMPARISON OF STATE AND TRAIT ANXIETY MEANS PRESENTED BY SPIELBERGER, GORSUCH, AND LUSHENE (1969) WITH STATE AND TRAIT ANXIETY MEANS OBTAINED FROM SAMPLE OF SENIOR CITIZENS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>State Means</th>
<th>Trait Means</th>
<th>Range of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spielberger, et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman males</td>
<td>40.01</td>
<td>38.07</td>
<td>State: 40.01 - 35.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>39.39</td>
<td>38.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates males</td>
<td>36.35</td>
<td>37.68</td>
<td>Trait: 41.61 - 37.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>35.12</td>
<td>38.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School males</td>
<td>36.99</td>
<td>39.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>37.57</td>
<td>41.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemeth Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>33.15</td>
<td>38.21</td>
<td>State: 36.63 - 30.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>36.31</td>
<td>39.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trait: 39.92 - 36.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Test</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>39.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td>31.63</td>
<td>37.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Time Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Test</td>
<td>36.13</td>
<td>39.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td>30.17</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Test</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>39.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for the Spielberger, et al., samples appears to be somewhat higher on State Anxiety than the range of means for this population of senior citizens.

In regard to Wanted Affection (FB6), a comparison of the means obtained from the present study with the norms presented by Schutz (1967) again revealed no gross differences (Table 16). Here it is important to note that Schutz's samples were somewhat broader than Spielberger's with scores on people up to and including age 65. As can be seen from Tables 15 and 16, in all three comparisons, the means on the State Anxiety, Trait Anxiety, and Wanted Affection variables are within or close to those presented by Spielberger and Schutz.

This also appears to be the case in regard to a comparison of the norms presented by Rotter (1966) with the means obtained from this sample (Table 17). Most apparent is the fact that the range of means for Rotter's samples of college students and the range of means for this sample of senior citizens are almost identical.

The Pearson product moment correlation coefficients (Table 18) showed significant correlations between State Anxiety and Trait Anxiety and between the following eight FIRO-B sub-tests: FB1 (Expressed Inclusion) - FB2 (Expressed Control), FB1 (Expressed Inclusion) - FB3 (Expressed Affection), FB1 (Expressed Inclusion) - FB4 (Wanted Inclusion), FB1 (Expressed Inclusion) - FB6 (Wanted Affection), FB2 (Expressed Control) - FB4 (Wanted Inclusion), FB3 (Expressed Affection) - FB4 (Wanted Inclusion), FB3 (Expressed Affection) - FB6 (Wanted Affection), and FB4 (Wanted Inclusion) - FB6 (Wanted Affection). What was not
**TABLE 16**

A COMPARISON OF FB6 (WANTED AFFECTION) MEANS PRESENTED BY SCHUTZ (1967) WITH FB6 MEANS OBTAINED FROM SAMPLE OF SENIOR CITIZENS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>FB6 Means</th>
<th>Range of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schutz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling Salesmen from a large pencil company</td>
<td>25-65</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Business School Graduate Students</td>
<td>24-38</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.9-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California Medical School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced students</td>
<td>23-33</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>23-55</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard freshmen</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radcliffe freshmen</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Deepfreeze Personnel</td>
<td>22-60</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administrators</td>
<td>26-64</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Architects</td>
<td>36-65</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Psychology Majors</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Physics Majors</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemeth</td>
<td>60-83</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.8-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Pre Test</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Time Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Test</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Test</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 17
A COMPARISON OF I-E MEANS PRESENTED BY ROTTER (1966)
AND I-E MEANS OBTAINED FROM SAMPLE OF SENIOR CITIZENS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Psychology Students</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Psychology Students</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Psychology Students</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Psychology Students</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Psychology Students</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>9.62 - 7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Psychology Students</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro Students</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Corps Trainees</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C*</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner, Age 18-26</td>
<td>M(white)</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade plus reading</td>
<td>M(black)</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>10.00 - 5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th grade college applicants</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Stratified Sample, Purdue Opinion Poll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th, 11th, &amp; 12th grades</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-year-old subjects from Boston Area</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Combined
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Pre Test</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>9.58 - 7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Time</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Pre Test</td>
<td>9.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Pre Test</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Test</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18
PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I-E State Trait</th>
<th>FB 1</th>
<th>FB 2</th>
<th>FB 3</th>
<th>FB 4</th>
<th>FB 5</th>
<th>FB 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Internal-External Control)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (State Anxiety)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait (Trait Anxiety)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB1 (Expressed Inclusion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB2 (Expressed Control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB3 (Expressed Affection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB4 (Wanted Inclusion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB5 (Wanted Control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB6 (Wanted Affection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the .01 level
* Significant at the .05 level.
expected was the significant correlation between Internal-External Control (I-E) and Wanted Control (FB5). Apparently, in this instance, movement toward internal control was accompanied by a decrease in Wanted Control.

In summary, statistical results showed that four of the nine dependent measures showed significant changes due to treatment (State Anxiety, Trait Anxiety, Wanted Affection (FB6), and Internal-External Control). In each instance the group by time interaction showed a decrease in scores obtained by senior citizens from pre- and post-test data due to treatment. However, it should be noted that both State and Trait Anxiety showed a significant decrease due to time alone. This can be explained quite readily by the highly significant decrease in scores of the treatment group which would, when averaged with the control group, significantly decrease that overall mean. From the results obtained by the control group, it was apparent that test-retest familiarization did not play a significant role in this experiment, in that in none of the variables measured were there any significant decreases in scores on the post-test measures for the control group.

Further, a comparison of the norms compiled by other researchers for the State Anxiety, Trait Anxiety, Wanted Affection, and Internal-External Control means with means obtained by senior citizens in this sample yielded no striking or gross differences due to age. Interestingly enough, the means for the State Anxiety measures on this sample of senior citizens were somewhat lower than the means for the State Anxiety measures drawn from Spielberger's population norms for adolescents and young adults.
Experiential

Excerpts from the final staff debriefing session may be found in Appendix D. A theme analysis revealed the following attitudinal or behavioral changes due to the laboratory training weekend experience. Code letters (e.g., Mrs. EA, Mr. EB, etc.) were assigned to each senior citizen who assisted in this experiment. A complete list of the coding process and that individual's I-E, FIRO-B, and STAI scores may be found in Appendix C. To ensure confidentiality, all comments made to the staff members by the experimental group are listed by code.

A. Main Themes:

1. The lab facilitated friendships.
   a. "We've played a lot of games here on Wednesday (referring to Bingo), but I never got to know anybody and in this weekend I got to know people . . . and it was the first time." Mrs. EA, Mr. EB, Mrs. EJ, and Mrs. ET.
   b. Mr. EF said that he allowed himself to get to know other people for the first time in eighteen years and, specifically, he stated to member of his group, "I live down from you, so you don't see me as often. But I'll see you more often now, because I know you."

2. The lab facilitated trying out new behaviors.
   a. Mrs. EN said, "I had an opportunity to get up and do things in front of a group of people and it was the first time I had ever done that . . . and, they liked me."

3. The lab facilitated positive group action.
a. Mrs. EI and her group decided to go over to the hospital (two blocks away) and do some volunteer work; specifically, rolling bandages.

b. In regard to the above, Mrs. EW discovered that "other people are interested in doing the same things that I am interested in doing. You know, I haven't been doing those things because I didn't know anyone who would be interested in going with me."

c. One group (Mrs. EC, Mrs. EK, Mrs. EM, and Mr. EP) decided to take action to improve the grounds by planting flowers. This group reported that "even though we have lived close together, we had not gotten to know one another; but now that we have, we intend to plan to do more things together."

d. Mrs. EU and Mrs. ET suggested the possibility of a pot luck supper.

4. The lab gave participants an opportunity to get in touch with themselves and to share with one another.

a. People who felt lonely had an opportunity to share their feelings with others. Many shared that they "felt like antiques, old and useless." (Mrs. EG and Mrs. EM).

b. Mrs. EV and Mrs. EK shared that they had an opportunity to get in touch with their physical selves, their strengths and their limitations, and to explore how they used those to either their advantage or disadvantage.

c. Mrs. EJ chose not to share, and that was OK, too.
5. The lab gave participants an opportunity to make new contracts with one another in regard to their roles and expectations.
   a. Mrs. EO and Mrs. EQ who had taken it upon themselves to assume leadership positions, found out that other residents felt that they didn't need to be led. They reacted somewhat pathologically at first and tried to put a damper on the lab and the research. But, the group didn't go along with their efforts.

6. The lab gave participants an opportunity to view one another in a more realistic manner.
   a. In an interchange between Mrs. EI and Mrs. EO, the latter was not able to grasp what was occurring. However, two other group members were able to tune in and shared with the group and with Mrs. EO that they would assist her with that concept.
   b. In regard to the above, before that interchange, Mrs. EO was viewed as a very self-sufficient woman, oriented toward helping others. During the lab, Mrs. EX and Mrs. EA were able to get in touch with her need for assistance and ways in which they could be of assistance to her.

7. The lab gave staff members and participants an opportunity to learn more about each other and to reformulate their perceptions and expectations.
   a. People had different sets for the laboratory training weekend workshop. Specifically, Mrs. EQ thought she was under
investigation. Therefore, she kept probing as to whether the staff was truly interested in her or whether they just wanted to study her.

b. At first, participants thought that the staff might serve as their liaison between the Housing Authority and the Baton Rouge Recreation Commission in order to help them get screen doors and to get the Recreation building open full time. (At the time the lab took place, the recreation building was only open two hours a week. It was kept locked the rest of the time.) During the course of the lab, staff and participants negotiated their roles and functions. It was decided that the staff could best be of assistance by helping the participants learn new ways of accomplishing their goals through group action.

c. Some participants couldn't understand why the staff would want to spend time with "old folks like us." (Mrs. ES, Mrs. ER, and Mrs. EX).

d. The staff was called upon to open up and to share. There wasn't just an experimenter-experimentee or trainer-trainee flavor to this experience. This laboratory provided the staff with an especially unique opportunity to explore their own feelings about aging and old people and to get some feedback from people who really knew what it was all about.
DISCUSSION

Results from this present investigation lent strong support to the hypothesis that laboratory training could be an effective means of retarding or reversing the disengagement process in senior citizens. Statistical data showed considerable reductions in State Anxiety, Trait Anxiety, Wanted Affection and External Control due to treatment. Experiential data indicated that this group of senior citizens from the Southern Colonial Complex was quite able to handle an experiential and somewhat ambiguous approach toward learning and to do so in both a creative and a comfortable manner. Both statistical and experiential data revealed profiles of individuals who were becoming more comfortable with themselves, who were learning to take more responsibility for their lives, who were enjoying the process of forming new interpersonal relationships, and who were getting in touch with their own strengths and abilities. All the aforementioned factors are considered key to the continuation of an engaged style of living.

Therefore, in regard to the senior citizens who participated in this experiment, the above data supported the hypotheses that (1) an individual senior citizen's behavior was amenable to change, (2) that change could occur in a short-term interpersonal, experiential setting (specifically, a laboratory training weekend workshop) and (3) that laboratory training did offer a feasible and practical approach toward retarding or reversing the disengagement process.
**Staff Learning Yield**

As is often the case in laboratory training, the staff experiential learning yield was as great as that of the participants, if not greater. The laboratory training workshop offered staff members unique opportunities to get in touch with their own gerontophobia and to process their feelings with individuals who knew what being old was all about. In this process, the senior citizens were the facilitators and the staff members were the experiencers.

It became especially clear during the lab that even though only one simple goal had been set by the Lab Manager--namely, to see if a laboratory training, experiential learning approach was possible with senior citizens--each staff member and each participant brought a certain set of goals or expectations with him to the lab. These included the following:

1. Staff expectations
   a. To build a self-concept so as to modify the attitudes that these senior citizens had toward themselves.
   b. To help senior citizens develop a sense of power.
   c. To serve as catalysts, providing some stimulation into the system and providing these individuals with some ice-breaking experiences.
   d. To design experiences into the lab with a social intervention flavor.
   e. To design experiences into the lab with an experiential learning flavor.
f. To serve as a catalyst for organizational development.
g. To be facilitative in whatever way was needed.
h. To create a sense of community among the Southern Colonial Residents.

2. Participant expectations.
   a. To have people assist them in getting screen doors and in getting the Recreation Building open full time.
   b. To participate in a research project with the hope that other older people would thereby benefit from whatever came out of this venture.
   c. To get to know other people in the complex.
   d. To learn what the staff was all about.
   e. To have an opportunity to talk about themselves and to get some feedback.

It was necessary to spend time, both in the lab and in the staffings, working on these various concepts. It was, at times, very difficult for a rather young and energetic staff to contain some of their idealism and to accept more realistic goals. For example, some of the trainers had difficulty in accepting the fact that senior citizens conceptualized and thus responded somewhat slower than the average college sophomore. There was also a tendency for staff members to assume strong personal responsibility for any experience that they perceived as failing or as "not coming through." This is evident throughout the final debriefing session (Appendix D). Staff members were unusually hard on themselves throughout the lab.
However, one of the strongest learnings was the fact that these older people weren't really as "old" as staff members had perceived them to be.

Staff members were delighted by their ability to stay in tune throughout the lab. In many instances, the participants were even more perceptive than the staff. For example, the participants were aware of the staff's conflicts with goals and expectations and they took it upon themselves to set their own goals and expectations for this experience. This relieved staff members of a considerable amount of tenseness and anxiety. It also assisted staff members in getting in touch with their own flexibility so that they could then respond to where the participants needed for them to be. In this process, staff members were able to experience that, even when directing a situation in which they are assisting others in learning, coping, and growing, they can and must only take responsibility for their own behavior. However, throughout the lab, role modeling and positive reinforcement became essential staff functions. Here, the participants were also of great assistance, for when role modeling was inappropriate, as when staff members grouped by themselves in order to redesign a portion of the Sunday session, participants were very quick to express their feelings and to offer feedback.

Most successfully built into the lab were opportunities to explore how this group of senior citizens dealt with confusion and ambiguity. It was learned that the large majority of participants attempted to make order out of perceived chaos or uncertainty by
reverting to their memories and past experiences. It became clear that this was a strong asset to them in dealing with the present and in planning for the future. However, here again staff members were somewhat impatient with the participants as they related stories and experiences in an effort to make their point.

Impatience, anxiety, and gerontophobia were three of the most salient personal factors with which staff members had to constantly deal as they attempted to be effective in working with these senior citizens.

Recommendations

It was apparent from this investigation that even when hampered by slowing cognitive and perceptual skills, this group of senior citizens had, overall, more abilities, strengths, and resources than anticipated by the lab staff. These individuals were very definitely able to learn from the experiences provided during the weekend workshop. However, what was most apparent was the staff's need to make better use of the memories, resources, and experiences that the senior citizens attempted to share. The exercise which was seen by both staff and participants as being most effective was the one which employed full use of the above factors. That exercise was the Country Fair.

During the lab, attempts were made by the staff to be honest with the participants, to show a genuine interest, and to stay away from "jargon" or "psychologizing." This should be continued in future lab planning for the elderly. It is further recommended that at least
two or three one-afternoon follow-up labs be planned for any group of senior citizens that takes part in a laboratory training weekend workshop. Six particular training errors were noted in this experiment:

(1) Too many observers were allowed. It is recommended that only participating staff members be present and that all staff be involved in planning and programming.

(2) Spot staffings should be both legitimized and encouraged throughout the lab. These should be built into the lab design (e.g., a fishbowl approach) so that participants do not perceive a secretive aura about training.

(3) Staff members should become more aware of their own body language and what they are really communicating to each other and to the participants. Therefore, staff members should continue to be open to feedback from participants.

(4) Expectations should be aired during the opening sessions so as to give both staff and participants a firm base upon which to operate.

(5) In order to make maximum use of the rich memory resources possessed by senior citizens, more projective and creative experiences should be designed.

(6) Lastly, staff members should do more listening and less directing, thus enabling them to become more comfortable with the participants' need to share past experiences.

In terms of experimental design, it is suggested that further labs be designed with an equal number of people in both the experimental and
control groups. In this experiment, the heavy statistical weighting given to the control group clouded the results of the analysis of variance on the Internal-External Control Variable. Equally matched experimental and control groups would avoid such difficulties. Further, the importance of offering both groups an opportunity to benefit from laboratory training should be noted.

Lastly, it is suggested that a replication of this study, including the following changes in design, be made:

1. It is recommended that three equally matched groups be employed. However, being that it is difficult to obtain equally matched groups, it is suggested that the groups be matched on the basis of the Biographical Data Inventory (Appendix D) employed by Nemeth and Fuselier (1972) and the MMSBS (Appendix C) employed by Nemeth (1971).

2. It is further recommended that the above groups be divided as follows:
   a) Group I—Schedule, Laboratory Training Weekend Workshop.
   b) Group II—Schedule, Special Weekend Social Events (e.g., barbeque, bingo, etc.).
   c) Group III—Schedule, Business as usual.

After the data has been collected, it is recommended that each group be given an opportunity to be involved in the laboratory training experience, in the weekend social events experience, and in the business as usual experience and that another set of data be collected to further explore the merits of laboratory training for the elderly.
Conclusions

The adaptation of an ecological approach to the problem of social disengagement is offered as a feasible way of initiating change both within the individual and within his environment. In this regard, the role of the community in assisting the elderly person in continuing an engaged pattern of living is essential. Thus, the continued cooperation of academic disciplines and community agencies in exploring the problems of the elderly and in adapting theoretically sound programs of social intervention is purported. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that more experientially based laboratory learning workshops be designed for senior citizens. As is evident from this experience, laboratory training can have a multitude of functions as it serves to assist senior citizens with personal, interpersonal, and organizational growth and development. This process of continual growth, as hypothesized by Carl G. Jung, is seen as one of the most effective psychosocial deterrents to the process of disengagement. This author is in full agreement with Aring (1972) who suggests that a healthy prescription for growing old is one that emphasizes the growing and not the aging.
SUMMARY

This study was the conclusion of a tri-partite investigation of the disengagement process which is presently occurring among senior citizens in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The purpose of this project was to develop a practical and feasible method of social intervention designed to retard or reverse the disengagement process.

In the first phase (Nemeth, 1971) of the project, an active group of senior citizens was explored in order to determine the natural limits of social engagement among the elderly.

In the second phase (Nemeth and Fuselier, 1972), an interview capable of screening and selecting senior citizens who could best benefit from methods of social intervention was developed.

In the third phase an attempt was made to design a short-term experiential setting—specifically, a weekend laboratory training workshop—which would facilitate change in the process of social disengagement. Measures of behavioral change were incorporated in this design. For example, the Internal-External Control Scale (Rotter, 1966) was employed to assess any shift in locus-of-control; the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientations—Behavior (Schutz, 1960) was employed to assess any change in behavior as measured by wanted or expressed feelings of Inclusion, Control, and Affection; and, the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger, 1966) was included as a measure of State Anxiety and Trait Anxiety.
The aforementioned measures yielded scores for nine dependent variables which were then submitted to nine separate analyses of variance. Four of the nine dependent measures revealed significant results due to treatment. Specifically they were as follows: there was a significant reduction in State Anxiety, Trait Anxiety, Wanted Affection (FB6) and External Control evidenced in the Experimental Group after participation in the laboratory training weekend workshop.

Further, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients revealed significant relationships between State Anxiety and Trait Anxiety, between eight of the fifteen possible correlations among the six FIRO-B variables, and between movement toward Internal Control and less expression of Wanted Control (FB5).

Lastly, a comparison of the norms compiled by other researchers with means obtained by senior citizens in this sample yielded no striking or gross differences due to age.

An analysis of experiential data led to the following conclusions:

1. The lab facilitated friendships.
2. The lab facilitated trying out new behaviors.
3. The lab facilitated positive group action.
4. The lab gave participants an opportunity to get in touch with themselves and to share with one another.
5. The lab gave participants an opportunity to make new contracts with one another in regard to their roles and expectations.
6. The lab gave participants an opportunity to view one another in a more realistic manner.

7. The lab gave staff members and participants an opportunity to learn more about one another and to reformulate their perceptions and expectations.

In regard to the senior citizens who participated in this experiment, statistical and experiential data lent strong support to the following hypotheses:

1. An individual senior citizen's behavior was amenable to change.

2. Change could occur in a short-term interpersonal, experiential setting (specifically, a laboratory training weekend workshop).

3. And, lastly, laboratory training did offer a feasible and practical approach toward retarding or reversing the disengagement process.

Further, laboratory training was suggested as an effective means of assisting senior citizens in learning, coping, and growing. Specifically, it was concluded that data from this laboratory training weekend experience revealed profiles of individuals who were becoming more comfortable with themselves, who were learning to take more responsibility for their lives, who were enjoying the process of forming new interpersonal relationships, and who were getting in touch with their own strengths and abilities—all of which are considered key to healthy aging.
Staff members had an opportunity to process their own feelings of impatience, anxiety, and gerontophobia as they attempted to work with elderly people.

Finally, recommendations for improvements in the laboratory and experimental designs were offered.
REFERENCES


113


APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

A REPRODUCTION OF THE XYZ INTERVIEW USED IN NEMETH (1971)

NAME ___________________________ INTERVIEWED BY ___________________________

AGE ___________ DATE ___________________________

MARRIED _______ SINGLE _______

SPOUSE LIVING? _______ DECEASED? _______

CHILDREN _______________ NUMBER _______

1. Person is brought to door and introduced to Examiner. E stands up and says, "Hello, Mr...." E then extends his hand.

1) Score + if person enters and approaches E ______

2) Score + if any discriminable response to greeting ______

3) Score + if response is verbal and appropriate ______

4) Score + if person shakes hand ______

5. E says, "Won't you have a seat?"

5) Score + if person sits without further urging ______

6. E sits and says, "How are you today?"

6) Score + any discriminable response to the question ______

7) Score + if response is verbal and appropriate ______

8. "I have misplaced my pen, do you see it?"

8) Score + if person finds pen at once ______

9) Score + if person finds pen same time E does ______
"I have a few questions I would like to ask you."

I. FAMILY OR FRIENDS

A. When was the last time you held a baby?

B. Do you engage in lively conversations with folks outside your home?

C. How often do you visit relatives?

D. When you visit relatives how often do you go out of their home?

E. How often do you discuss your health with friends, family, or doctor?

F. How often do you get together with your closest friends?

G. Do you see more or less of these friends than you did five years ago?

II. SOCIAL ENGAGEMENT

A. When was the last time you went into town to shop or to look around?

B. How many clubs or organizations do you take part in weekly?

C. Are you more active or less active in clubs or groups than you were five years ago?

D. How often do you find it possible to attend church and its activities?

E. Do you ever go out of your way to speak to young people of college age? _____ If so, when was the last time? _____
F. Do you own a car? _____ How often do you drive it? _____

G. How does the transportation situation affect your ability to get around?

H. When was the last time you took a vacation?

I. When was the last time you enjoyed a party?

J. Would you say you are in good health? _____ Comment ________
   Is your health a determining factor in your getting out and mingling?

III. PERSONAL ACTIVITY

A. What are the ways you get exercise?

B. What is your favorite television program and what time does it come on? __________________________ How often do you watch it? ______

C. How often do you watch or listen to the news on radio or TV?

D. How often do you read a book or newspaper?

E. When was the last time you got into a debate on politics?

F. What activity do you do to keep you outdoors at least three hours?

G. Do you ever work in the yard and garden? _____ If so, have you ever entered any contests with your flowers or plants?
IV. COMMUNITY

A. Have you ever worked with handicapped or underprivileged children?

B. How would you feel if you were asked to work with a mentally retarded child?

C. Do you go to civic events, concerts, or the theatre?

D. When was the last time you voted in a local or national election.

E. When was the last time you were in a library or art center?

SENTENCE COMPLETION

1. In my neighborhood I object most to ____________________________
   ____________________________

2. In my city I object most to ____________________________
   ____________________________

3. If given the opportunity I could benefit the community by ______
   ____________________________

4. The young people of today ____________________________
   ____________________________

5. In 5 years this country will be ____________________________
   ____________________________
6. Being over sixty is ________________________________

7. For me, retirement brought about a ________________________________

8. My friends are ________________________________

9. I enjoy spending most of my time ________________________________

10. For me, Life is ________________________________

Behavior questions after Section I

10. Score + if person makes any verbal responses, irrespective of content to all the questions in the above section _________

11. Score + to any remarks about a picture of E's baby daughter _______

Behavior questions after Section II

12. Score + if person makes any verbal response, irrespective of content to all of the questions in the above section _________

13. Score + if person responses to headache feigned by E ________

Behavior questions after Section III

14. Score + if person reacts to E throwing a piece of paper in the wastebasket and saying "Fiddlesticks, missed again." _________

15. Score + if person, after E expresses interest in his hobby, offers to teach it to E. ________

16. Score + if person makes any verbal response, irrespective of content, to all the questions in the above section _________
Behavior questions after Section IV

17. Score + if person makes any verbal response, irrespective of content, to all the questions in the above sections ______

18. Score + when handing person form, if he reaches for it automatically __________

19. Score + if person looks for a pencil on desk or asks for it ______

20. Score + if person completes all of the form information ______

21. E rises and extends hand saying "Thank you very much, Mr....."
   21) Score + if person rises from chair with E ______
   22) Score + if person opens door, before going out says something__

23. Items 23 through 30 are based on the behavior of the person throughout the interview
   23) Score + unless inappropriate grimaces or mannerisms are readily apparent ______
   24) Score + if person at anytime looks E in the eye ______
   25) Score + unless person obviously appears to avoid E's gaze at any time or stares at E fixedly ______

26. Score + unless person's clothes are sloppy ______

27. Score + if person remains attentive throughout the interview ______

28. Score + if person makes no objection to the length of the interview ______

29. Score + if person makes an attempt to offer support for the research project ______

30. Score + if person asks for more information about the research project or volunteers more time or information ______
APPENDIX B

A REPRODUCTION OF THE INTERVIEW USED TO DETERMINE RESIDENT GROUP DIFFERENCES (NEMETH & FUSELIER, 1972)

Interview # ________

Name _______________________________ Interviewed by ________________

Age ____________ Date __________________________

Race:  ___ Caucasian  Religious Preference: __________________________

___ Negro  _________________________________________

___ Oriental  Marital status:

Majority of ancestry:   ___ Married

____________________  ___ Single

Number of Children _____  ___ Divorced or Separated

Spouse: ___ Living  ___ Dead

MMSBS (Modified Minimal Social Behavior Scale)

1. Person is brought to door and introduced to Interviewer. I stands up and says, "Hello, Mr...." I then extends his hand.
   1) Score + if person enters and approaches I __________
   2) Score + if any discriminable response to greeting __________
   3) Score + if response is verbal and appropriate __________
   4) Score + if person shakes hands __________

5. I says, "Won't you have a seat?"
   5) Score + if person sits without further urging __________

6. I sits and says, "How are you today?"
   6) Score + any discriminable response to question __________
   7) Score + if response is verbal and appropriate __________
8. "I have misplaced my pen, do you see it?"

8) Score + if person finds pen at once
9) Score + if person finds pen same time I does

BDI (Biographical Data Inventory)

1. At present time my age is:
   ___55-59 ___75-79
   ___60-64 ___80-84
   ___65-69 ___85-89
   ___70-74 ___90- and up

2. My present height is:
   ___5'4" or shorter ___5'11" to 6'1"
   ___5'5" to 5'7" ___6'2" or taller
   ___5'8" to 5'10"

3. My present weight is:
   ___130 pounds or less ___171 to 190 pounds
   ___131 pounds to 150 ___191 pounds or more
   ___151 to 170 pounds

4. The number of living brothers and sisters I have now is:
   ___None ___Three
   ___One ___More
   ___Two

5. The highest educational level I attained was:
   ___None
   ___Some grade school
   ___Grade school completed
5. (continued)

___ Some high school
___ Completed high school
___ Some college
___ Completed college
___ Master's degree or equivalent
___ Doctor's degree or equivalent (PhD, MD, etc.)

6. In the past five years, I have lived

___ alone
___ with spouse
___ with children
___ with family
___ in a nursing home
___ ____________ other

7. The type of community I lived in during my childhood was

___ primarily rural (farming)
___ small town other than farming community
___ college town
___ medium sized city
___ large city

8. When I first went on a trip of over 100 miles by myself, my age was

___ Younger than 10
___ 21 to 25
___ 11 to 15
___ 26 and over
___ 16 to 20
___ never travelled over 100 miles
9. As a young person, I remember that my immediate family was:
   ___ not always able to make ends meet
   ___ able to have necessities only
   ___ able to live comfortably
   ___ well to do
   ___ quite wealthy

10. When I earned my first money on a regular job (other than from members of my family), my age was
    ___ younger than 8       ___ 13 to 14
    ___ 8 to 10              ___ older than 14
    ___ 11 to 12

11. The number of jobs I have held in my life is
    ___ None       ___1 ___2 ___3 ___more

12. The amount of recognition which I receive for my accomplishments is
    ___ None
    ___ occasional recognition but not often
    ___ about as much as anyone else
    ___ as much as is deserved
    ___ sometimes more than is deserved

13. On a list of 100 typical people in the kind of job I can do best, I would belong in the
    ___ top
    ___ among the few best
    ___ above the average
    ___ about average
    ___ below average
    ___ I haven't given it much thought
14. During my life the number of cities, towns or townships in which I have lived was

___one
___2 to 4
___5 to 8
___9 or more
___I don't know

15. The type of community in which I lived most of my adult life was

___primarily rural (farming)
___small town other than farming community
___college town
___medium sized city
___large city

16. The type of community in which I would have preferred to live is

___primarily rural
___small town other than farming community
___college town
___medium sized city
___large city

17. In the past I have had

___no close friends
___one or two close friends
___a small group of close friends
___a great many close friends
___almost everyone I knew
18. I think it would be desirable to have

____ no close friends
____ one or two close friends
____ a small group of close friends
____ a great many close friends
____ almost everyone I know

19. I now have

____ no close friends
____ one or two close friends
____ a small group of close friends
____ a great many close friends
____ almost everyone I know

20. In comparison with most of the people I know, I am able to make new friends

____ much easier
____ a little easier
____ with the same effort
____ with somewhat more difficulty
____ with a great deal more difficulty
____ I haven't given it much thought

21. I believe most of the people I know tend to think of me as

____ quite different from them emotionally
____ only slightly different from them in emotional make-up
____ very much like them in emotional make-up
____ I haven't given it much thought
22. In the past month, I have attended a party or social gathering
   ___ not at all
   ___ once
   ___ twice
   ___ 3 times
   ___ 4 or more times

23. In comparison with most other people, as the life of the party or the leader of conversation at social gatherings, I am
   ___ at the top
   ___ among the few best
   ___ above the average
   ___ about average
   ___ below average
   ___ I haven't given it much thought

24. My physical condition is
   ___ poor - need rest or medical treatment often
   ___ fair - can work regularly but don't always feel quite right
   ___ good - as good as that of most people
   ___ excellent - can tackle anything
   ___ perfect - can drive hard on anything night or day

25. I go to a doctor or medical facility
   ___ Once a week       ___ once every two months
   ___ twice a month    ___ once every 3 to 6 months
   ___ once a month     ___ only 6 to 12 months
   ___ less than once a year
26. On the average the number of hours a day I spend at home are

_____ less than 2      _____ 8 to 10
_____ 2 to 4           _____ 11 or more
_____ 5 to 7

27. The time I spend away from home is mostly

_____ talking with friends
_____ shopping
_____ in clubs
_____ doing community activities
other _______________________

28. Thinking back to yesterday, how much time did you spend talking with someone else

_____ less than one hour
_____ one to 2 hours
_____ two to three hours
_____ three to four hours

29. In the past week, I have spoken to a young person (between the ages of 17 and 21)

_____ not at all        _____ 3 times
_____ once              _____ 4 or more times
_____ twice

30. The last time I took care of a child was

_____ yesterday
_____ last week
_____ last month
_____ last year
_____ longer
31. The number of clubs or organizations that I take an active part in is
   ____ one  ____ three  ____ five
   ____ two  ____ four  ____ more

32. In the past month, I have participated in church related activities
   ____ not at all  ____ 3 times
   ____ once  ____ 4 or more times
   ____ twice

33. In the past 4 years, I have voted in a national or local election
   ____ not at all
   ____ once
   ____ twice
   ____ 3 times
   ____ 4 or more times

34. My most frequent mode of transportation is
   ____ walking
   ____ riding bicycle
   ____ my car
   ____ someone else's car
   ____ bus
   ____ taxi

35. I would say that transportation is
   ____ no problem to me
   ____ somewhat of a problem
   ____ one big impossible headache
MMSBS (continued)

10. Score + if person answers all of the questions

11. I rises and extends hand saying "Thank you very much, Mr. ...."

11) Score + if person rises from chair with I

12) Score + if person opens door, before going out says something

13. Items 13 through 18 are based on the behavior of the person throughout the interview

13) Score + unless inappropriate grimaces or mannerisms are readily apparent

14) Score + if person at anytime looks I in the eye

15) Score + unless person obviously appears to avoid I's gaze at any time or stares at I fixedly

16. Score + unless person's clothes are sloppy

17. Score + if person remains attentive throughout the interview

18. Score + if person makes no objection to the length of the interview
### APPENDIX C: RAW DATA FOR THE NINE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE AND THE CODING PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBS</th>
<th>Group (Code Group)</th>
<th>Person # and (Code Name)</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>FB1</th>
<th>FB2</th>
<th>FB3</th>
<th>FB4</th>
<th>FB5</th>
<th>FB6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E 1</td>
<td>Mrs. EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>E 1</td>
<td>Mrs. EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E 2</td>
<td>Mr. EB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E 2</td>
<td>Mr. EB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E 3</td>
<td>Mrs. EC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E 3</td>
<td>Mrs. EC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>E 4</td>
<td>Mr. ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E 4</td>
<td>Mr. ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>E 5</td>
<td>Mrs. EE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>E 5</td>
<td>Mrs. EE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>E 6</td>
<td>Mr. EF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>E 6</td>
<td>Mr. EF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E 7</td>
<td>Mrs. EG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>E 7</td>
<td>Mrs. EG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>E 8</td>
<td>Mrs. EH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>E 8</td>
<td>Mrs. EH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>E 9</td>
<td>Mrs. EI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>E 9</td>
<td>Mrs. EI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>E 10</td>
<td>Mrs. EJ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>E 10</td>
<td>Mrs. EJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>E 11</td>
<td>Mrs. EK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>E 11</td>
<td>Mrs. EK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>E 12</td>
<td>Mrs. EL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>E 12</td>
<td>Mrs. EL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>E 13</td>
<td>Mrs. EM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>E 13</td>
<td>Mrs. EM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>E 14</td>
<td>Mrs. EN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>E 14</td>
<td>Mrs. EN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBS</td>
<td>Group (Code Group)</td>
<td>Person # and (Code Name)</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>FB1</td>
<td>FB2</td>
<td>FB3</td>
<td>FB4</td>
<td>FB5</td>
<td>FB6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>E 15</td>
<td>Mrs. EO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>E 15</td>
<td>Mrs. EO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>E 16</td>
<td>Mr. EP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>E 16</td>
<td>Mr. EP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>E 17</td>
<td>Mrs. EQ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>E 17</td>
<td>Mrs. EQ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>E 18</td>
<td>Mrs. ER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>E 18</td>
<td>Mrs. ER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>E 19</td>
<td>Mrs. ES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>E 19</td>
<td>Mrs. ES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>E 20</td>
<td>Mrs. ET</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>E 20</td>
<td>Mrs. ET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>E 21</td>
<td>Mrs. EU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>E 21</td>
<td>Mrs. EU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>E 22</td>
<td>Mrs. EV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>E 22</td>
<td>Mrs. EV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>E 23</td>
<td>Mrs. EW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>E 23</td>
<td>Mrs. EW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>E 24</td>
<td>Mrs. EX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>E 24</td>
<td>Mrs. EX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>C 1</td>
<td>Mrs. CA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>C 1</td>
<td>Mrs. CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>C 2</td>
<td>Mr. CB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>C 2</td>
<td>Mr. CB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>C 3</td>
<td>Mr. CC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>C 3</td>
<td>Mr. CC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>C 4</td>
<td>Mr. CD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>C 4</td>
<td>Mr. CD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBS</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Person # and Code Name</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>FB1</th>
<th>FB2</th>
<th>FB3</th>
<th>FB4</th>
<th>FB5</th>
<th>FB6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5 Mrs. CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6 Mrs. CF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7 Mrs. CG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8 Mrs. CH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mary: I feel real tense.
Mike: Yeah.
Darlyne: I am too.
Mary: Yesterday I didn't feel as tense...

Mary: ...I didn't know what exactly what to expect... You know, it was something I had seen, like in the movies or something and I had heard Darlyne talk about it, but I had never experienced anything like that and I would really be interested in doing it again.

Darlyne: I thought it was a good beginning here, Mary.
Mary: It was.
Darlyne: I don't know how far we got in terms of our goals and what not, but I thought it was a beginning. One thing that several of the people said to me today at five o'clock, which I thought was very significant, is that "we've played a lot of games here on Wednesday, but I never got to know anybody and in this weekend I got to know people and it was the first time." I had at least three or four comments like that, specifically, Mrs. EA, Mr. EB, Mrs. EJ, and Mrs. ET.

Jim: I think some of them decided to do some positive actions, like when Mrs. EI was saying they had decided to go over to the hospital and do some volunteer work.
Darlyne: Yeah, I thought that was really good.

Jim: And Mrs. EW told me that she was very happy she'd come because now she... she had always wanted to go over there and do some volunteer work, bandaging and stuff... but now she's found some other people who want to do it with her, so she feels compelled to go over there now.

Darlyne: Right.

Jim: Because of the other people. And then this group that Mary was in (Mrs. EC, Mrs. EK, Mrs. EM, and Mr. EP) were going to plant flowers.

Darlyne: That was a nice group.

Mary: They were really happy with their ideas and plans.

Jim: They were each going to chip in a dollar, I think.

Mary: But what was interesting also is that some of the people in my group live sort of close together anyway and now they are planning to do things together. I wonder if that happened in any of the other groups.

Darlyne: They may.

Mike: Some of them already were doing things together.

Darlyne: This is the beginning though and apparently the large majority of them had not gotten together previously to do things.

June: I'm wondering what in terms of your own expectations...I say yours rather than mine because I think you had some expectations before I came... in terms of goals and
everything...whether you feel like you're satisfied and what
the tensions are that you feel and what the satisfactions are.
Mary, you were talking about some tension, I wonder what
might it be.

Mary: I really haven't thought about it. You know, I just feel
this way, now it could be that I just didn't feel good
physically today. I think that was it. And then to an
extent I got a little frustrated because I think I got the
feeling something wasn't coming through. Now I think at the
end, a few people...I think if we had gotten them to say...
like we were doing toward the end...you know, admitting
well, yes, there are other people who don't do this and,
yes, I can if I want to...but yet all the rest of the time,
it was like coaxing. And it just didn't come, you know,
like it did at the end. And when you're trying to reach out,
you know, I think that's what made me tense.

Lynn: Did you have something that you wanted them to say?

Mary: I think that I wanted them to realize, you know, that to-
gether they can do things. And together, not just the
people that they do things with already, but to include
other people. And then sort of get together and project
ideas into the future. Have thoughts that just don't end at
five o'clock Sunday.

June: Do you think that that's an unreal expectation?

Mary: No.
Scott: How do you account for Mr. EF's comments...at the very end?
Darlyne: I thought they were really great.
Scott: The fact that just meeting somebody and talking to him, how he'd never really been able to do that...or...he hadn't done it. And now he knew people and he could talk to them as he was walking through the complex. Now, he had places to go...you know, people who don't live above you or right beside you. You know, how we were talking the other day about how the architectural design of these apartments cuts down on communication...'cause it's all boxy...so you might interact in your building, but two buildings down, you wouldn't. And he was talking to some people today, specifically in his group, and this was one of the things he brought up. "I live down from you, so you don't see me as often. But, I'll see you more often now, because I know you now."
Darlyne: And one thing he was saying is that about 18 years ago he lived in a situation where he got a chance to do this, but this is the first time in 18 years that he was able to do this.
Mike: I felt, mmm, I saw that, but I was hoping they'd get something more out of it. Not just in terms of knowing one another, but in terms of seeing one another.
June: Maybe they did get more than that.
Mike: No, I don't think they saw the strength that each one of them has.
Mary: I don't think so either. I think you had a lot of very lonely people, who just wanted to talk. I mean I saw that in the XYZ center this past summer and I see it now. I've seen it with old people all along, anywhere you go, they are lonely and I think...like in my group...they (Mrs. EG and Mrs. EM) got off on the idea that they were antiques, they were old, they were...useless. And I think that was one of the major ideas that we should have worked on. To dispell the idea that...so you're 65...your life's not over. I think if you could get them to overcome that they would say...so I'm 65, I can still mingle. For these people that's their biggest fear..."I'm useless."

June: I agree with what you're saying, but I disagree with the fact that none of that was done. I think a lot of that was accomplished, Mary.

Mary: Yes, I agree there, because I think some of them, specifically Mrs. EV and Mr. EK, talked it out...you know..."My legs are still OK, if I use them a lot." And everything, but I feel that a lot more could have been done along that line. Of course, I wouldn't know exactly how.

Darlyne: You don't know really what to expect the first time, ah, you try something like this with Senior Citizens and I think basically that's why I wanted to do it. That was my goal...to find out what was possible. And I know just in terms of the original proposal it was the efficacy of laboratory training with the elderly, period. You know, because I didn't
even know if it was possible.

Lynn: Good point.

Mike: But that brings up another thing, why all this confusion with them then about what it was all about. Like we're just doing it for our training.

Darlyne: This I didn't understand.

Mike: I didn't understand it either.

Darlyne: This is something that Mrs. EQ seemed to have picked up.

Lynn: Was there any point when you were interviewing them or talking with them that you told them what it was all about?

Darlyne: I thought I did this in the individual letters I sent to them. And I think we were very explicit.

Lynn: What did that say?

Darlyne: Basically we invited them to participate in a weekend laboratory training workshop during which they would have an opportunity to share themselves, specifically, their interests, attitudes, and behaviors, with others, and that this was an opportunity to participate in an experienced-oriented learning program. Also, we shared that this information would be incorporated into our research program.

Mary: I think one statement that we put in there...discuss your needs and interests...I think that misled them, right there, because...

Mike: Did you bring up in the letter about your grant?
Darlyne: I did say that the project was being sponsored, in part, by the Louisiana Commission on Aging and the Department of Psychology at LSU, and that we had the cooperation of BREC and the Housing Authority, and that I was a graduate student at LSU, because I didn't want to deceive them about it.

Mike: Because I can see from that how they had their initial set that this was an investigation, like, and that we were going to help them out.

Scott: Not only that, but we had all these people come in from LSU. We had June coming in from Houston. And I mean, Mrs. ES, Mrs. ER, and Mrs. EX asked why would we want to come in for three days to spend our time with an old age housing project in Baton Rouge, La.

Mike: They couldn't believe that!

Scott: You know, theoretically, there was no reason why we should do this.

Jim: Then they heard the word psychology and I think that was synonymous with psychiatry to Mrs. EQ.

Scott: And we were very guarded...we stayed away from jargon...and didn't use any of the typical laboratory training words... like we didn't call the different parts of the lab, exercises. We were more common about it.

Mike: More concrete, I think, that's what we had in mind.

Scott: Not using a specialized vocabulary.

Darlyne: Yes, that's right. That was built into the design.
Scott: And I think every now and then I did hear it slip and, if they were perceptive enough, they probably would have picked this up. Laboratory just once used in a context like that... and you think you're a specimen.

Mike: Right.

Scott: That's always a danger when you're working with a group of people that don't understand the philosophical concepts, and terminology.

Mike: I guess, in large, the reason that I was disappointed at the end was that they laid it all out for themselves and didn't grasp it.

Darlyne: How do you know that, Mike? Just 'cause they weren't as quick to respond as we are?

June: Laid it out how?

Mike: Especially the thing with Mrs. EI and Mrs. EO. Mrs. EI wanted to help this lady because the lady couldn't come without a cane. Mrs. EO had two canes, one of which she wasn't using and then she went into this thing about "never give up." And, you know, I felt that they should see that.

Mary: Mrs. EX picked it up, I think, that's what I noticed there.

Jim: I think Mrs. EA was on to it too.

Mary: Right.

June: I do too...I think they were planning to help Mrs. EO see that.

Scott: Were we expecting them to pick it up too fast?

Mary: I don't think Mrs. EO could. I think she was more self-oriented at that point.
Jim: She seemed to be rather skeptical about everything.

Mary: I noticed that she was more interested in teaching me how to bake a cake and she couldn't turn herself loose long enough to really look at things, you know, she's totally self...
I mean, when she wants to, she can see. But then it stops, you know.

Lynn: In a way she was being kind of facetious...at least I read it that way because she had been saying to me kind of before about the painting, you know, it's a bunch of crazy people in here making all these things.

Darlyne: Perhaps it was her way of handling herself in a stressful situation.

Mary: Yeah.

Lynn: I don't know, because when you were saying how beautiful it was, she in her own special way said...bullshit.

Mike: I have some mixed feelings about that mural.

June: The one thing about finger painting as opposed to the magic markers we used, is that no one has any special skills in it. There's no right or wrong in it. By the same token, I don't think that the mural they produced with the magic markers could be called a success or a failure by our standards. I think they did something that maybe they hadn't done before.

Darlyne: Yes, and there were a lot of individual and group feelings expressed in that mural.

Mary: That's true, but it was unfortunate that one person, namely
Mrs. EO, tries to put such a visible damper on it. That's what bothered me, because she was trying to exert her influence over several people. I think people looked to her for a while.

June: I think a lot of these people were beginning to get very tired of Mrs. EO.

Darlyne: I think so too.

June: And this was helpful. You know, I am not disappointed, and I'll tell you why. I think Mrs. EO, when they saw her expound, and when Mrs. EQ put herself in her own special box, they got weary of this and other people began to get in touch with their own strengths and came to challenge...Mrs. EI for instance.

Mike: Yes.

June: I don't think in terms of success and failure we can really measure because we don't really know what's happening inside each one of them.

Mike: Yes, that's true. But I still feel disappointed. I am not sure why or what I expected.

Lynn: I think part of it with me was that I was never really clear with myself what I was doing, and why I was doing it...kind of what my goals were. And it seems like there were a couple of three options opened. One was to kind of build a self concept to modify the attitude that old people have towards themselves. Another direction was to help them develop a
sense of power, and I think that was where we mostly were at, I think, at one point. And the other thing, I think where I ended up most, although it was still pretty unclear, was that we were kind of catalysts and that we were providing some stimulation in the system and providing people with some kind of like ice breaking experiences where they could get to know other people and kind of open up a little bit...the, communication between people in the project...which has maybe not a learning value, so much as an intervention value. Like an intervention brought into the system...You've increased feelings about other people because they're now going to know other people.

Mike: But we haven't increased their self-esteem, which was what we needed to do because invariably what I got from everybody when I was saying au revoir was this kind of disbelief that young people like us would come out and spend some time with worthless old people like them.

Mary: Could I say something here, and I'd like to direct this to Darlyne...You know how I feel about this...you know when we started working at the XYZ Center...for the first, let's say month, I felt the same way, sort of negative, but the more we did it and the more we got ourselves in the groove...and I think toward the end we and the oldsters each started thinking differently. If we could take that interview back... I mean the one we have now, is really great and put it to them
again...I think it would give us a lot of additional information, because these people were just...I mean...they were the type...although they were active, they were still individuals. And we and they started off negative and unsure and we both worked to the positive. Now I believe you would have to spend more time with these people here. Even if we had one or two more labs. That would go a long way.

Darlyne: Yes, I see your point. I think this was a beginning. I really do. I think a good beginning.

Mary: Most old people you start with are going to be negative anyway.

Darlyne: Not necessarily. It's not so much negative, Mary, it's that they're not going to believe that you really are interested in them.

Mary: We saw that at the XYZ Center.

Mike: They think that you're just studying old people.

Darlyne: And, I don't know, even though it's always good to bring out the negative things, and they are very important and we are all disappointed in one way or another. I keep thinking to all the good things that happened. The individual things, the positive things, the little things. The little growth that I saw, that I picked up just one-to-one personally or that I overheard glimpses of in a group, that really made me feel good...it made me feel...well, I'm not going to sound like a good samaritan...but it made me feel it was worth it...the effort.

Mike: Yeah.
Jim: I think we really stirred them up quite a lot...you know, and I think it really shows that laboratory training techniques are possible with older people.

June: I think so too.

Jim: Like what Mike said...I really picked up on that...the thing you said about...ah...you felt that old people weren't really old after all. 'Cause that's exactly how I felt.

Darlyne: That was good.

Mary: Yes, I think that was a perfect statement.

Jim: Sometimes I felt older than some of them. Like Mrs. EI, I felt older than her.

(The group chuckled about this)

Jim: And she's 83!

Darlyne: She was trying to get you married to her granddaughter. But this might be a good point to say to you, Jim, and to you, Scott, and to you, Mary...I was really, really pleased with the way you just sort of went right in there and became...well, you all were a part before...but in terms of participating in the laboratory aspects of it...with which you've had not too much exposure...I felt very good about it. And I felt very comfortable with you in there as facilitators. And that was good.

June: I liked your attitude.

Darlyne: It was an "I care" attitude...which was for real. And I think that's more important...I don't care how good a person
is at laboratory training or at anything...but if they don't show that they care...and are for real...they're totally ineffective.

June: I feel that too...not just for Scott, Jim, and Mary...but for the rest of our staff as well. And here again, in terms of expectations...I think something was accomplished. And in any lab, we have certain expectations as trainers and training has some expectations and we aren't sure what they were...for the training...what each one of us hoped for. As far as I'm concerned, I saw some changes taking place.

Mike: That's true.

June: And any disappointment is sort of hard to fall back on because we don't know what would have happened had we moved otherwise. We really don't know. Ah, I saw enough changes taking place in persons and differences in responses to people like Mrs. EQ that I have some real hopes. And I think that Mary pointed up something that's very key. I think maybe to not let this be the end of their laboratory experience, but rather a beginning.

Darlyne: Yes, this is something that Don (Glad) had suggested too.

June: I think maybe it will also allow them the good feeling that this wasn't just an experiment but that they're really trying to help us...or help us be ourselves.

Mary: What I was saying is this...we spent what about three months with the XYZ Center...and one lady told me that they're
still asking for us...I mean, they still remember us. They remember us with good feelings...even though it was just an interview-interaction experience. It gave them a real opportunity to talk about themselves. But I feel out here we are in these people's backyards so to speak...we're in their homes...and I think honestly, if we did another lab or two just to get them together...really.

June: We could do it for one afternoon. And let them know that this was not just another experiment...that there was another aim to it too. But, in a sense, it was an experiment, and maybe this is OK to say it was.

Mike: Yes.

June: I felt kind of uncomfortable today with Mrs. EQ's accusations. None of us could really answer her.

Mike: What could we say.

June: Maybe it would have been helpful to have dealt with her one-to-one in front of the other people. That's what I'm wondering.

Mary: Well, what did she say?

Mike: I felt that no matter what we said...

June: She thought that we were "psychologizing" her.

Darlyne: Yes, she asked me when she came in whether we were going to send her to Jackson (location of nearest state mental hospital) at the end of this. I kept telling Mrs. EQ that this is not the purpose of what we're here for. And she wouldn't believe it.
Mike: She was dressed for a funeral today...all in black.

Darlyne: Yeah.

Scott: I am sure her feeling was motivated by a lot of different things. For one thing, she was dethroned, so to speak, the group decided they didn't need her to be the queen-mother anymore. Also, I, at times, felt that there was an over presence of people with shirts and ties on. I felt really nervous about that. At the very beginning.

Darlyne: At what?

Scott: At the proliferation of outsiders.

Mike: With shirts and ties?

Scott: Yeah. Especially like the day Tom came to just observe but didn't get involved. It was like we had a task force there at times, I felt.

Darlyne: Yes. This is one thing I felt very uncomfortable about especially at one point...when you all were in a circle by yourselves...almost all the trainers were...specifically when you bent over and covered your mouths...did you notice?

June: Yes, I noticed.

Mike: Nothing was going on, though.

Darlyne: But the way it looked was bad...body language, you know.

Mary: Mrs. EQ really got sort of upset about it.

Darlyne: She said, what are they doing over there, and she had every right to feel that way.

Mary: Jim picked it up and said, well, they're just over there making plans for what comes next.
Lynn: Not very perceptive of us, was it?
Mary: She was really sort of paranoid. But, still, we should have handled that better.
Lynn: Yeah, well. I think I feel like...it's a dilemma...what they want from us is not what we're willing to give...nor is it the best thing for them in the long run. My interest is in helping them to learn how better to help each other and to live with each other in their community. It's not on the level of wanting to become more involved personally in their lives...which I think is kind of the double message...the inconsistency I was hearing. I am concerned and I would like to learn some skills, but to become involved personally, myself, in their lives...that's not why I was there.
Mary: Well, what they were mostly interested in was to get some screen doors, they thought that we were going to be the liaison between BREC and the Housing Authority, that's what Mr. EB thought anyway.
Mike: In a way, this was exactly antithetical with what our purpose was. Our purpose was to help them to feel like they could accomplish these things for themselves. And they thought that our purpose was for us to do these things for them. So that's not a good starting point right there.
June: OK. Maybe Expectations...ah...the number one thing we might do differently next time...is to be sure expectations are carefully put out on the table. Whether they're picked up or not...that's another thing.
Lynn: I think that part of the problem is that we weren't invited into the system. You know, most stuff we do is consultation-type things. I feel very uncomfortable when I am going into a system uninvited...unless that there's a kind of contract that I should be there. And it's sort of like we're coming in because we think that you have a need...and whether you think so or not.

Darlyne: Right on.

Scott: Even though it doesn't sound good, it really comes down to what Mrs. EQ was saying...that if it wasn't for the fact that Darlyne was doing this research at this point, we never would have been there this weekend.

June: I don't think that was all that appropriate.

Lynn: Maybe one way they had of managing us, coming into their system uninvited was to see us as...to sort of say, well, now, maybe we can get something out of this. That maybe we can get these people to get us some screen doors.

Darlyne: I think he's right there.

Jim: When I did the interviews a lot of times...I know I told the people in the interview...that one thing we hope to gain was how to plan future complexes like this one...that could be where they got some of these things. And when they came in here face to face, they said, well what does this have to do with planning of future complexes.
Scott: But that was one assumption under which we did the operation, too. How to modify the environment? Remember that's one question Mr. Diamond of the Housing Authority asked us?

Darlyne: So that was one of our tasks...to learn about how well this environment is conducive to their needs.

Mary: Well, I'm sure all of us could say, well they need this and they need that, and everything...but I know that if we had said...we want to come in and let's all get together and we're going to explore each other...as far as being an individual...they would look at us and say...what kind of nut are you? But if we had said, let's get together for a good old fashioned social, you would have had them more at ease.

June: Yes, but that isn't what we're doing. I mean, if we were going to get together and have a ...I hear some real wisdom in what you're saying, Mary...but this is not what we were doing.

Mary: Right...I agree...but what I am saying is that some hesitancy was only natural.

June: Although I would like to see a good old fashioned pot lunch supper grow out of this.

Darlyne: One was mentioned, Mrs. EU and Mrs. ET were going to see about getting one off the ground.

Mary: I think they became very interested in doing things together.

June: I really think that in a lot of ways we learned some things that will help all of us in working with elderly people.
For one thing, we know that you can't take the real vacuum of a laboratory training situation and not get on because they will fill the vacuum on the situation with what they know...and that is...talking with each other about themselves. And group interaction will mainly concern each person talking something out and being responded to. And I hope as a result, they will know each other better. And maybe will have picked up the feeling of doing something different. I feel like yesterday was particularly a high point...and yet a lot of them reverted to their memories...and that's where it was...and that's OK too.

Darlyne:  Mm-Hmm.

Scott:  It's all that they have to operate on right now.

Lynn:  That's a resource they have.

Mike:  That's reasonable...what, some have 80 some years of experiences!

June:  They learned one thing very quickly and that was the mass confusion of Friday was largely gone by yesterday.

Scott:  And also the fact that we had some attrition each day with people feeling comfortable enough to come and go and attend to their own needs.

Mike:  Some people couldn't hear too well and had a hard time understanding what was going on.

Darlyne:  I think some people really didn't want to open up and they were sensitive enough to hear that we really did want them to
open up...to a certain degree...and share. I know that this was especially true in Mrs. ET's case. I picked this up right away. She knew where we wanted her to go and she didn't want to go there. And this is legitimate. I think it scared her too much to go there...and, so she backed off. And that was acceptable to the other members of her group. So, it was OK. And I wonder if that might not have been the case with some others...But I can say positive to this that most people were able to handle this and perhaps they can use and pass on some of these things...I won't even call them new skills...let me just say...new friends...Maybe, you know, just the fact that they reached out and got to know one other person that they can walk down and see...maybe that will start the ball rolling, to produce more of a community there ...I mean, when you talk about the goals and the purposes of the lab, I come back to what we originally thought of in terms of organizational creation or community creation where there was none before. And perhaps there might be a little step toward that now.

Mary: Well, Darlyne, can I say something here? I think Lynn brought out a good point in that perhaps we should have spent more time together before the lab sharing our individual goals for this happening and also our feelings and fears, perhaps, about working with old folks, and I would have felt more comfortable if I had. Then we would have had more of a rapport and we could have really gone into the lab and just hit it.
Mike: There were a lot of ways in which this was an atypical situation, and this was one of them. Another one is that we knew less about this group than any other group I've ever worked with. Another one is that there were staff that were just there for one shot deals. For example, there should have been a better integration of our clinical backup people into the lab experience. Now, Don Glad served as both trainer and back up resource and was an integral part of that first day, but Ed Timmons didn't have that same opportunity, coming in on Sunday, I think it's a more efficient use of manpower, the first way. There weren't enough things for everybody to take charge of every day.

Lynn: In a way we had too many staff people.

Mike: But I think we wasted a lot of staff resource, because we have Mary and Scott and Jim...who have spent more time with these people than, I guess, the 4 or 5 of us who did most of the lab planning, and they in a way, should have had more to say about what we were doing.

Darlyne: I feel that's a loss for all of us.

Scott: But we did thoroughly brief Darlyne on our experiences and she had all this information at hand.

Jim: That's true, and, of course, she did a lot of the interviewing.

Mary: I agree. But I could have benefitted from getting in on a few planning sessions. I really didn't know what to expect. I felt like those people, more, I think. It made me tense, somewhat...walking in cold.
Mike: I got the feeling you felt a little lost, at first.
Mary: Yeah, I wanted somebody to sit me down and tell me what should I do. I felt at first like I was just wandering around until, you all told Jim and Scott and myself to each join a group as a member-facilitator. I felt much more comfortable then. At first I felt really lost.
Darlyne: I wonder too if that isn't helpful in terms of the way other people at the lab felt. You know in terms of how the old folks felt...if they didn't feel very similar to Mary.
Mary: Well, I think that we should continue with this and I think from this go another step...sort of pre and post...and I would imagine that you would see a tremendous difference.
But this time let's get our roles more clearly spelled out.
Mike: But, Mary, there's a danger in being too over-structured, too.
Mary: Well, that's true. I'd like for us to go in next time with here I am, I'm comfortable, I love you all.
Lynn: (Laugh) Unfortunately it doesn't always work that way.
Darlyne: I think we all had a good deal of anxiety and uneasiness about working with old folks in this kind of setting for the very first time.
Lynn: Also, Mary, a lot of things have to be changed at the last minute. And you have to be flexible enough to handle a good deal of ambiguity.
Mary: I'm learning that.
Mike: You've got to at least be at the same place that they are.
And that might require junking your whole plan for the day.
It's important also that in the closing minutes, you're kind of together...at the same place. That happened today, too, and that was important. You notice we had to shift some things at the last minute, today, too, in order to achieve this.

June: That's right.

Mike: Maybe we should talk about why the mural was a flop...I thought it was.

June: Did you think it was a flop? Well, maybe, because creative skills were called into play. This is one thing. How well one really expressed himself.

Darlyne: You know, I didn't think the mural was a flop at all.

June: I didn't think it was a flop either, but I think if there were any disappointment, it was...

Jim: I thought it was kind of neat.

Mary: I thought that the country fair was a really good theme. In fact, I heard several people say...I wish I could draw a country fair...or something like this...so, it stuck in their mind. And I feel like when something is in their mind, that you've put it there, that you're making progress.

Mike: Mm-Hmm.

Mary: And, of course, I was a former drama major, but I felt that if we get them to act out something...if you get them to...

Mike: We could have built this in more strongly into the design...

June: We did approach that with the country fair.

Mary: ... I thought that was great!

Darlyne: They enjoyed it yesterday.
Jim: I thought that was the best thing I saw through the whole thing...was that group with you, Mary, in which the members were acting out different things. Like the lady, Mrs. EN, who said that was the first time ever she had gotten up and done something in front of a group of people...the first time she had ever done it...and they like her. That really got to me. That made me feel good.

June: Me, too.

Mike: When we were planning that, we all had great reservations. We didn't think they could handle that.

Lynn: Yeah! What you're saying about...about them having eighty years of memory is a resource...and we might be able to make more use of that...in a fantasy kind of thing...I had the feeling that if we took a trip together...kind of thing...with people contributing various things from their memories and experiences...what sensations kick off...that that might be a good thing.

Mary: I agree, because one of the things that we found at the XYZ Center was that the people rambled, yes, but some of the things, if you sit down and listen to them, they could tell you marvelous things.

Darlyne: They have a lot more just in living experience than we do.

Mary: We can be more philosophical, but these people can actually tell you stories and relate their experiences.

Lynn: Yeah, it's fascinating, isn't it?
Darlyne: You know what? I think the thing that I learned more than anything else this weekend was that, ah, old people can do a lot more than I thought they could.

Scott: Amen.

Darlyne: And I think I really underestimated them.

Mike: And I think a lot of them...maybe they can't conceptualize as fast or as well as they used to be able to, but I think if you do it with them, that they can understand you.

Darlyne: MmHmm. We have to slow down a little bit.

Lynn: I'm still wondering about laboratory training as the best intervention in this particular system.

Darlyne: I don't know about the best. We really don't have anything to compare it with.

Mike: Do you have something else in mind?

Lynn: You know we're talking about community building kind of things...that doesn't necessarily have to be in the guise of laboratory training...that can be somebody coming to the center five times a week...like that...you know...and getting them together and doing various things. Maybe some things like we did. And I still am having trouble knowing what my goals were and would be...in working with them...and if laboratory training...lends itself or is best suited for those goals. That's what I'm still hassling with. That's a really strong question for me.

Scott: But if the goals were interaction among the group than laboratory training would be ideal. But if you're trying to organize
for community action...you might need someone there... five days a week to be coordinator of community action or something.

Mike: Well, we were heading into this with partly an organizational development flavor built into the lab. But I don't think we gave the OD part a fair test. I think that can be accomplished via laboratory training and then they can elect their own community action people. Don't forget there was a certain uncertainty and ambiguity about what the lab was all about. And they didn't know what to expect from themselves as well as from us.

Darlyne: But sometimes I think that that can lead to a very creative situation, though. Life isn't just all just spelled out and perfectly planned...especially in the late years.

Scott: Also, we might have had too many tests prior to coming into it, too. What, with the interview...and then the I-E and FIRO-B. A lot of people wanted to get past the questions...like Mrs. ES said today...well, come see me...and don't bring any questions.

Darlyne: A lot of people at the end said that they hope our paths would cross again.

Jim: But many didn't mind the questions...they were kind of eager about having been selected for the project and they wanted to give us all the benefit of their experience, so that we could learn more about older people and be able to help others. Many of them saw this as a real opportunity to help so that other older people might have it a little better.
Mary: That's what I got a lot. But, Mr. EB really made me feel sad, when he walked up to me and told me that he really felt bad about his lack of education...and I think he felt he was stupid...or inferior...because he didn't have an education.

Darlyne: How did you handle that, Mary?

Mary: I shared with him that this type of learning here in the lab was based on experiences and that formal education wasn't important here.

Scott: In this particular case, I talked with him about this at some length also...but he uses that...because he's quite well read...in history and politics...sometimes he uses his lack of formal education as a way of controlling things. For example, you might think he's way down there, but sometimes, he can come up behind you and really get you.

June: He's a very deceptive guy.

Mary: A lot of time with these people, you can't tell the book by its cover or take them at face value.

Jim: That's what too often happens.

June: As we saw here, these are very individual people who have one thing in common...they just happen to be old. But we shouldn't clump them.

Darlyne: Remember, those were the results of the intermediate project Dwayne and I did...we too often ignore the individual needs of older people...and concentrate on the old part, not the people part.
Mike: Well, that's one thing a lab can do...is address itself to both individual and group needs...sometimes simultaneously.

Jim: I think that some of the people were really perceptive and picked up on things...for example, there was a time when one of our people wasn't in tune and Mrs. EL picked it up before we did...she said..."he's really not in touch is he? He really doesn't know that we're here to try and find out more about each other."...and things like that. And I picked up that she was saying that she really knew what was going on.

Darlyne: Mrs. EH also expressed that. Perhaps, they set our goals for us. And we responded to where they were, rather than them responding to where we were.

Scott: Also, it was the first time that many of us as facilitators or trainers or clinical backups were really in a situation where we were called upon to open up and do some really deep sharing. And if you hadn't worked the aging thing through yourself...well, it showed. But, this was a unique opportunity to do so, and they really helped us.

Mike: Not all of us were in the same place about working with old people or about growing old ourselves. Remember when Glad dealt with that at the beginning of the lab? That was really beautiful.

Darlyne: I was wondering if maybe we could take these last fifteen minutes to...again, we talked about the mass confusion, and a lot of other things...and I want to say, that just in terms
of this entire project...it's been the type of thing where its been very exploratory...And I think one of the most important things for me was that I got a feel for where older people really were that I never really had before. And I was just wondering in these last 10 or 15 minutes if we could really look toward some of the positive things that came out of it...and the positive things that we felt in terms of feedback toward one another...if we could share some of those things...in terms of negative feedback too...but what I'm trying to do...I think one of the things that Don's always said about the end of a lab...and that's that everybody's always looking toward the things that they let down on or that didn't go well...or that didn't meet their expectations...But, then, when you get away from it for a little while, sometimes you can see other things that were good. And I'm wondering if we could explore possibilities in that direction? One of the things, just in terms of you, June, I felt very good about you coming in and really providing some leadership which I did not care to take because I did not want them to get dependent upon me. And for me this was a good thing.

Scott: As an individual just coming in, I can't...I mean there's no way of expressing my feelings...the comfort. I came in a little nervous and ignorant...more ignorant than nervous. But, ah, June, you made me feel so comfortable and at home. It was just really fantastic.
Mary: I think that showed all the way through the lab, because I know, when I first met you I thought to myself... boy, she is a bubbly individual. Isn't it wonderful to see this enthusiasm... Because I'll tell you, throughout the project I guess I've seen negatives and positives, but you have such an even positive viewpoint... that I couldn't help but get enthused yesterday. It was really wonderful. I think it went through to everyone.

Darlyne: June, we didn't ask you if you wanted any feedback.

June: I do want feedback. Negative and positive.

Darlyne: Well, sometimes I think we all preached too much. And that's something that Lynn pointed out which was really good.

June: And of course, Lynn has a strong background in lab work... both Lynn and Mike do. That was a real asset.

Mike: I enjoyed working with you, June.

June: I would like to know if I come on too strong though.

Lynn: No, in fact, I felt a little uncomfortable about your being so sensitive about that. Maybe, you've been told that before.

June: No, I never have. It's just that I came in as an outsider and I wasn't sure of my position and I didn't want to push anyone down.

Lynn: There was no way you could have hauled me down.

(Laughter)

June: I'm glad to hear that. Real glad.

Mike: You shouldn't feel like an outsider because actually you've been one of us for days.
June: I didn't know that.

Scott: You're really an insider.

June: OK, I accept that.

Mike: I do think, though, that you spoke a little too softly sometimes.

Jim: And you didn't carry a big enough stick.

Mary: But, Jim, I like that, though, I really like that because like Don got a little loud and like Lynn tended to scream a little bit, but you did it in such a subtle way that you...

Darlyne: Feminine quality...

Mary: Yes...

Lynn: Subtle screamer...

Mary: You never really got your big stick out and that really got to me...how effective you were.

Lynn: Beautiful screamer...(sung to the tune of "Beautiful Dreamer")

Darlyne: Just in terms of you, Lynn...I never have given you any feedback, but one of the most helpful things to me that you did is added a positive...if I can say...negative dimension...

All the way through the grant, I've had a lot of negative feedback...but not in a positive way that we could do anything with. And you were able to say, now look, Gang...hold it...I feel this way and we need to work on this. I've had a lot of "I feel this way, period"... or I don't like this, period." Constructive criticism is refreshing...not that I felt you were all negative. I want to make that clear.

Lynn: I'm glad you said that.
Darlyne: But the interventions you made...in terms of expressing your feelings and stating where you were when you weren't in a place that we were...especially when we were feeling better than we should...were done in a way that made me feel that it was a positive thing. And that was really helpful. And also, just in terms of both you and Mike. I just really, really felt that you both wanted to do this and it was, you know...well, for me it was a great feeling.

Jim: I agree.

Mary: I felt like...when I first heard you all were going to work... I thought...Darlyne had to blackmail them...or something. And when I saw you giving above and beyond the call of duty... I felt that was really beautiful.

Lynn: Didn't she pay you Mary?

(Laughter)

Note: None of the trainers, facilitators, or backup resources received any financial payment for their work. They were all volunteer. June's travel and room expenses were paid for her, but she volunteered her time.

June: Lynn is particularly perceptive in the way Darlyne was talking about. He can pick up on something that isn't quite going... according to the way it should go...and instead of saying... I don't like it...he would say...why...why don't we do so and so.

Lynn: Yeah.
June: And I really like that. I count on your perceptions. I found that today was really...

Darlyne: A good barometer.

June: Yeah, really good. And I think, Mike, your ability to get inside the skin of these older people was really helpful. And I would like to see how you work with other populations too. I wouldn't be a bit surprised if you do the same with them. But with Lynn's perception and you're sort of sensitivity...it seems from the outside that you're getting under their skin...I don't know how you do it. I even like the way you handle it. And I want to say it finally so I don't get on the plane without saying it. I think for three people (Mary, Jim, and Scott) not having been in laboratory training before...I'm amazed and surprised. I hope you all will continue. Not only continue but get right in the middle of it and with Darlyne, I think you're just really gutsy and good at this. You've gotten some people on your team that are really top notch...I'm sure that this whole project has been a real struggle for you in a lot of ways...and I can see a lot of them...but for a prescription I would say, ah, feel your support and rely on your competence. It's all there, just keep tapping it...

Mary: You know, Darlyne, I was so apprehensive last week...thinking that it might be a flop...I had to just sort of keep shoving that idea aside. And I really feel like we took the first
step this past summer at the XYZ Center...and now I feel that this is another major step. And it will go from here.

Darlyne: And I'm really hoping just in terms of Scott and Jim that this is something you all might continue after I graduate. Because really it's just a beginning. All we did was examine a couple of possibilities and open a few doors. But it was really, I think a major beginning for Baton Rouge, because nobody's doing any significant work at all with older people here...and I think there's so much potential for us and the Department. I really do. And I'd like to see more research in that area by people who have more skills than I do.

June: Thinking that this may be a possibility to continue, there are two things that I would like to point out that I think might be helpful next time. And that is...at the beginning of the lab...not before the lab...when all of them are together really check out expectations. And I mean really, seriously...even if it takes a whole session. And then also...like today...with our little staff meeting besides the staffing...I mean, beside the general meeting, which we found out did not work and was not helpful...to legitimize that...because we did need to meet. We found out that some of our agenda wasn't going out as well as we thought it was...and we needed to meet as a staff...to somehow build in the fact that we may have to do this.

Darlyne: Perhaps we could do it in a fishbowl approach, so the participants around us could hear what we had to say.
June: Yeah...those are two things that I feel like might have helped and that is, first checking out expectations with everybody...ours and theirs...secondly to legitimize a staff meeting during the lab...not, not have it because we had to have it...but make it legitimate...build it into the design.

Darlyne: I think that's a good idea.

Lynn: Yeah, you are suggesting that we meet as a staff with the people around us.

Mike: Now that you've brought that out, there was an aura of secrecy like when some of the people came early. I thought one day we were all coming early so that we can meet as a staff...and I kept trying to convince them that they could stay and watch...that we'd like them to. And they just wouldn't believe it.

June: I'm sorry that we didn't pick up on that. Because you mentioned that to me.

Darlyne: I think it was...it wasn't so bad that the staff was meeting together...it's just that everybody was bent over so close and then with just a few overt behaviors that people picked up on...you know...it just immediately...the more sensitive people picked them up.

Mary: I agree with Darlyne...I think we have to watch that sort of thing...especially the cues that we as staff give off.

Darlyne: That's why I didn't come over...

Mary: Sure, when just two people are talking apart from me, I sometimes feel...well, they're talking about me. And in this
situation, it was a natural assumption. That covers it for me.

June: Sure, I do, too.

Lynn: That raises another issue...how you all felt.

Darlyne: Well, I didn't...I wouldn't have gone over there to that meeting...

Lynn: How did you feel about not being involved?

Jim: I felt like I...what in the training?

June: No, in that meeting and in some of the planning.

Jim: Well, like the other day when I went to the meeting, I didn't say a word because I didn't feel like I had anything to offer because, you know, I figured you all were the ones who have been in laboratory work...you've been trained in this field...

June: But you know the people.

Jim: Right, well, so I didn't know what to say...and I didn't have anything to offer. So, I didn't say anything. And, so...but then Friday night I felt like I had some real feedback to give...but I really didn't feel like I was qualified to say anything affecting what the planning should be...you know, I was just more or less listening...to see what the planning was going to be so I could pick up on it, and participate in it.

June: I think that's our failure and not yours.

Darlyne: I hope you don't feel that way any more Jim.

Mike: You should have let it be known.
Jim: Oh, no, I don't...

Scott: Well, how do you feel, Mary?

Mary: I like what I'm doing now. I really do. You know I told you I felt tense before...I feel perfectly relaxed and my eagerness is back up again. I was sort of up against the wall and now that we've sort of talked it around, I feel relaxed. If we had just stopped where we were, I'd have gone home and bit my husband's head off.

(Laughter)

June: It's really important to debrief. Just from our experiences here, we can see how important that staff-participant au revoir and debriefing session really was.

Darlyne: You know, it was really beautiful at the end of the lab...experiencing them saying au revoir to us and hello to themselves and each other. I think regardless of what we accomplished with this research effort, that in itself was enough for me. And I want to share with each one of you how grateful I am to you for putting your time, your efforts, and your full selves into this project. And now, we have to get June to the airport, so why don't we adjourn.
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